Case.	1426
1 2	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK
3 4 5 6 7 8 9	TRANSCRIPT OF CIVIL CAUSE FOR EVIDENTIARY HEARING BTEVEN SCHREIBER, United States Courthouse Brooklyn, New York August 5, 2016 9:30 a.m. EMIL FRIEDMAN, et al., Defendants. TRANSCRIPT OF CIVIL CAUSE FOR EVIDENTIARY HEARING BEFORE THE HONORABLE JAMES ORENSTEIN
11	UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
12	
13	APPEARANCES
14	For the Plaintiff: BY: JAY PHILIP NELKIN, ESQ. CAROL NELKIN, ESQ.
15	For the Defendants: BY: PAUL HANS SCHAFHAUSER, ESQ.
16	Emil Friedman and New York Best Coffee, Inc.
17	
18	For the Defendants: BY: DAVID B. GRANTZ, ESQ. E&I Investors Group, LLC; CATHERINE PASTRIKOS, ESQ. E&J Funding Co., LLC;
19	E&J Management Inc.; and E & Jeryg Management Corp., LLC
20	Court Reporter: LINDA D. DANELCZYK, RPR, CSR, OCR
21	Phone: 718-613-2330 Fax: 718-804-2712
22	Email: LindaDan226@gmail.com
23	
24	Proceedings recorded by mechanical stenography. Transcript produced by computer-aided transcription.
25	broaucea by computer araea cranscription.

accomplish that.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

On Friday, July 29th, which is, I believe, one week ago, I was unable to obtain confirmation that access had been restored. As I understood it, and as I understood until last night, I believe that I and my client, Mr. Friedman, were prevented from ourselves going on to Launch because it is a Two Rivers property, insofar it has Two Rivers' information. So I did not personally go on Launch and I directed, of course, my client not to the access Launch either. So the only thing that I was able to do to verify that Launch was reactivated was to communicate with Yossi and those working with him. On Friday, July 29th, when I discovered, I was advised by my client that he was unable to confirm from Yossi that Launch had been reactivated, I hit the roof and I demanded that I be given a phone number to speak with Yossi, myself and my client. During what I can only characterize as a very unhappy conversation, which lasted a while, I demanded on behalf of my client that access to Launch be immediately and unqualifiedly and fully restored. And Yossi who was on the phone with me and with my client stated that access would be immediately and unqualifiedly and fully restored. THE COURT: That was when?

This was on Friday and -- this was

MR. SCHAFHAUSER:

- a week ago Friday. And I'm placing this in context for what
 I'm about to say.
- So I advised Mr. Nelkin of this and it's in the record. I don't need to further belabor this point.

What Yossi told me was that access would be restored to the fullest same extent as it was when access was interrupted. That's what I understood, that's what I told Ms. Nelkin and Mr. Nelkin.

Last night I was in that room trying to get on to Launch with a number other people; defendants counsel,

Mr. Friedman was there, we were trying to get on. I communicated with Mr. Nelkin, Ms. Nelkin at several points along the way.

THE COURT: You're referring to the witness conference room?

MR. SCHAFHAUSER: Yes. Correct, Your Honor.

I believe that at one point in time -- Catherine, we were able to get on there once?

MS. PASTRIKOS: Yes.

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. SCHAFHAUSER: We were able to get on, in the witness room. We able to get on and then we stayed for a few hours in that witness room and we thought and believed that there -- I'm looking at Ms. Pastrikos because we were on her laptop, Your Honor. We thought that the issue was an internet connectivity issue with the Court's internet.

THE COURT: I know our WiFi for attorneys can be spotty.

MR. SCHAFHAUSER: Yes. So we were on and off and about, what it was 6:30, 6:00, at some point in time it was at 5:30, 6:00 we left. I was in traffic, I communicated by phone with Ms. Nelkin. Anyhow, let me fast forward. We attempted repeatedly to get access restored.

This morning, once again, because I was exceedingly frustrated that I was not able to confirm directly, I once again contacted Mr. Rogosnitzky, Yossi, with my client on the phone as I was driving to court, I was on the Garden State Parkway.

During the call, I again complained as to what was going on, why access had not been available yesterday during points of the evening, and during the course of that conversation — this is really the disclosure that I'm leading up to — in the course of that conversation, he advised me that — and I pulled over on the side of the road to scribble these notes — he advised me — and again, I don't represent him so there's no privilege, this is simply a disclosure.

He advised me that there was -- he had done a major upgrade to the Launch system in or about February 2016. He asserted that the original system remained available to Two Rivers through approximately April 2016.

I asked him immediately what system is now

- available? What system did you in fact upload? What version did you upload?
- THE COURT: Upload or upgrade?
- 4 MR. SCHAFHAUSER: Well, he upgraded the system. He said he upgraded the system.
- THE COURT: This is during the period when he wasn't providing access because of the fee dispute?
- 8 MR. SCHAFHAUSER: No, let me go back. Again, I'm
 9 not being as clear as I really should be.
- Your Honor, has heard, I think, testimony that

 Launch was -- went down in about February of 2016. Again, I

 don't have personal knowledge.
- 13 THE COURT: You're the lawyer, you don't have to have knowledge, as I understand it.
- 15 MR. SCHAFHAUSER: He has asserted --
- 16 THE COURT: What I have been hearing in Court the
 17 seven days out of this eight days of hearing, I've heard that
 18 on your side it's been attributed to a fee dispute.
- MR. SCHAFHAUSER: That's correct.
- 20 THE COURT: Okay. And during this fee dispute he did an upgrade.
- MR. SCHAFHAUSER: Apparently during this dispute, he did an upgrade and, again, I'm telling you what I heard an hour ago.
- 25 THE COURT: I don't assume that you ascribe any

1 | weight or credibility to that than I would.

MR. SCHAFHAUSER: I can only -- I can only report to the Court what I know.

THE COURT: Yes, please.

MR. SCHAFHAUSER: Okay. He asserts that he did, and what my notes indicate, is a major upgrade to the system because he apparently is marketing or selling or distributing or disseminating this system to other persons.

So he did an upgrade to the system. That upgrade apparently was done by him by, again, there's a two-month period that we're talking about. He did the upgrade, as I understand my notes on -- and that was on February 2nd, 2016. Again, I see people writing notes, I'm only telling you what I learned in conversation with Ms. Nelkin.

THE COURT: I think your disclaimer suffices. I don't need to hear it several more times.

MR. SCHAFHAUSER: He apparently kept access to the existing version of Launch available to Two Rivers, he asserts, through sometime in April, I don't have an exact date.

Now, why am I saying all this? I'm saying all this because when I learned this morning that what was uploaded by Yossi recently, and what is apparently on the system today, and by the way, he asserts that access is fully restored now, but what was apparently uploaded is not the version that was

available to Two Rivers and that was used by Two Rivers back in, let's say, February, but is the, quote, major updated version, to which I then asked: Well, what happened to the version that you told me a week ago you would be uploading to the system to have the identical information available to Two Rivers that was available before?

And he had represented that that version is also available and that -- and, again, I have no influence on this gentleman, Your Honor, but on behalf of my client and certainly as an officer of this Court, I, in the most blunt terms, asked him to make not just this new version available but the original version available so that everyone and plaintiff and Two Rivers and we have access to every piece of information and every data point.

Because I cannot now, as an officer of this Court, make heads or tails as to which version Yossi Rogosnitzky put on, and so I've now demanded that he do that. He purportedly agreed this morning at 8:30 that he would be doing that and is apparently in the process of doing that, but you can see my frustration.

THE COURT: I hear what you're saying. One area of confusion for me --

MR. SCHAFHAUSER: Yes.

THE COURT: -- and I may be showing my ignorance of technological matters, but if he's upgrading the system or

changing the system, that wouldn't have any affect, I would 1 2 assume, on the data stored on the system, correct? 3 MR. SCHAFHAUSER: I hope not. 4 THE COURT: So the matters discussed in this 5 morning's submission from the plaintiff regarding evidence of 6 previously undisclosed computers and evidence of data being 7 wiped out wouldn't entirely, if at all, be explained by an 8 upgrade to the software, correct? 9 MR. SCHAFHAUSER: And I'm not asserting that it 10 would be, Your Honor. 11 THE COURT: I see. 12 MR. SCHAFHAUSER: I'm actually -- I hope to get to 13 plaintiff's submission this morning momentarily. 14 My disclosure, what I'm telling Your Honor is 15 independent of a response, I'm simply trying to --16 THE COURT: Got you. MR. SCHAFHAUSER: -- disclose what I know, because 17 18 what I had understood to be on the line, I've now learned may 19 not -- it may be, but I'm not a tech person either -- it may 20 be the same thing, it maybe the same information, it maybe the 21 same data points. 22 But in light of my interactions with Yossi, I cannot 23 vouch for it, and I, as an officer of the Court, as a 24 representative of Mr. Friedman, I cannot vouch for what Yossi 25 did and what version, which is why I believe we all need --

all, both sides -- need both versions so that Stroz and any 1 2 forensic analyst that we may retain can compare what he did 3 and what's available. 4 That's all I wanted to say. I wanted to disclose 5 that. 6 THE COURT: There is no easy way to -- what do we 7 know about the server on which Launch is resident? 8 Physically, where is it and who has custody or control of it; 9 do vou know? 10 MR. SCHAFHAUSER: Well, I -- what I was able to 11 understand last night, and I'm going to be looking around the 12 table because I mangle these tech terms. But my understanding 13 is that that is a third-party vendor. 14 Mr. Grantz, who was it Vultan or? Okay. It was a 15 third-party vendor -- the answer is I think it's a third-party 16 vendor that rents this access. It's not something that --17 again, I -- well, Mr. Finkel is making the very good point 18 that I'm really speaking beyond the account of my knowledge 19 and I'm speculating. 20 THE COURT: Do you want to step in? 21 MR. FINKEL: We just made some inquiries yesterday 22 based upon what Ms. Nelkin -- or Mr. Nelkin, I forget which --23 made a representation about a particular vendor in Piscataway, 24 New Jersey. So we understand that that's a generally

We

available vendor that makes large storage space available.

25

1 do not know --2 I just want to know --THE COURT: 3 MR. FINKEL: We don't know, bottom line is -- at least I don't know -- where Yossi stores the data. 4 5 THE COURT: Okay. There's a server somewhere that 6 needs to be examined. Somebody has physical custody of it, we 7 need to identify the person or entity that does so an 8 appropriate court order or subpoena could be issued. 9 Does anybody have that information? 10 The only thing that I have heard, and I MR. NELKIN: 11 can't vouch for it, is that Stroz told me that they had looked 12 up somehow --13 The IP address? THE COURT: 14 The IP address, and it says it was this MR. NELKIN: 15 place, I think that they mentioned V-U-L-T-R in Piscataway. 16 THE COURT: Okay. 17 MR. NELKIN: But they didn't have any more information, it was based on an IP address. 18 19 THE COURT: Got you. Okay. 20 MR. FINKEL: That's all we know, Your Honor. 21 don't know, as far as I understand, at least I don't know 22 where Yossi stores his data. 23 THE COURT: Has anyone asked him? 24 MR. SCHAFHAUSER: I'm leaning over. Mr. Friedman 25 tells me that he asked him many times.

1	MR. FRIEDMAN: May I speak?
2	THE COURT: You may, but it's up to your lawyer.
3	It's between you and your lawyer if you decide if you want to
4	speak.
5	MR. SCHAFHAUSER: Mr. Friedman apparently asked him
6	a number of times, and Yossi asserted that it's his custody,
7	his property. There's been
8	THE COURT: Yeah, but if it's in the United States,
9	I assume it's subject to subpoena, I just want to know to who
10	the subpoena or a Court order or a warrant should be issued?
11	MR. SCHAFHAUSER: I'm in agreement with Your Honor.
12	THE COURT: Yes.
13	MR. SCHAFHAUSER: I'm in agreement.
14	THE COURT: But I use the word "warrant" for a
15	reason.
16	MR. SCHAFHAUSER: I understand you, Your Honor.
17	THE COURT: That the stakes are rising.
18	MR. SCHAFHAUSER: I understand, and we actually
19	agree, and I'm not here to defend Yossi and his conduct.
20	THE COURT: Okay. But I haven't gotten the answer
21	yet.
22	Has anyone asked him where this server is?
23	MR. SCHAFHAUSER: Apparently Yossi has refused to
24	disclose where it is to Mr. Friedman. Which, unfortunately,
25	is not is not inconsistent with Yossi's conduct during his

1 conversation with me. 2 Miss Nelkin. THE COURT: 3 MR. SCHAFHAUSER: Your Honor, let me say one last 4 thing. 5 I would support and join in any subpoena or order 6 with respect to the server. On behalf of Mr. Friedman, we 7 would join and support that at this juncture, and if it's this 8 Vultr entity somewhere in New Jersey -- Piscataway, we would 9 join in that. 10 THE COURT: Ms. Nelkin. MS. NELKIN: Your Honor, I'm going to let Jay Nelkin 11 12 address the technical issues. But I must tell you that I'm 13 simply astounded by what has happened here. 14 I practice law a long time and I have never seen 15 anything like what is going on. Just Mr. --16 17 THE COURT: I have, but not in a civil case. 18 That may be true, Your Honor. MS. NELKIN: 19 Mr. Schafhauser said he was going to address the 20 actual report that we filed, and you're absolutely right, this 21 has nothing to do with the fact that you ordered December 14th 22 for the computers to be preserved and imaged by December 15th. 23 And here we are, there's no way -- I mean, maybe 24 Stroz can tell us more about what happened when with all of

But it's really just extraordinary. And it

25

this data.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

available.

assumes that everyone is stupid, because the computer went down, Stroz was on it, Jay was on it -- I'll let him tell you more about it -- and it goes down shortly after. I told you in Court yesterday what we have found and what we want to do to bring you more information, and it miraculously goes back on at 7:00, approximately the time that we need to leave New Jersey to make it to the courthouse on time. You know --THE COURT: Well, I'm missing the point here, the inference you're drawing. The inference I'm drawing is that I MS. NELKIN: don't believe it's a coincidence that we were not able to get on. THE COURT: I get that. What's the agenda behind having the timing revolve around when you leave New Jersey to come here? Stroz remains active while you're here, correct? MS. NELKIN: Stroz checked every 30 minutes last night, and it only goes on because we would have no time to do the analysis that we wanted to do to look more into the computer and give you more information, which is why we asked for the recess, it was, I mean --THE COURT: I guess what I'm trying to -- what are you referring about the fact that it's only when you leave, even though Stroz is still there to gather information that's

What's the inference behind that?

MS. NELKIN: Your Honor, we asked for a recess yesterday in order to be able to obtain the material and bring you more information.

But the information that we gave you is only with regard to payroll records. There are records on that computer -- at least there were at one time -- with regard to the loans, with regard to the bank accounts, they're duplicate checks on that. There's a lot of information on Launch that goes to our proving our claims. And because the defendants always had possession of it, they -- I feel like they can manipulate it, and I think that's going to continue.

I think there are extraordinary issues of spoliation, and we have been given, over the last few days, multiple explanations as to why this system goes down, none of which are really very credible.

And I'm just saying that I believe that the system was intentionally taken down last night. I believe that despite -- and I don't doubt that Mr. Schafhauser was told what he was told, but I don't think it was an innocent thing.

THE COURT: I have a question. It probably is in some of the submission of the documents, so I missed it.

Has Stroz determined, with any level of confidence, the timing of when it has seen evidence of wiping technology, Mr. Nelkin?

MR. NELKIN: So they have seen -- at different

points, they've seen evidence of it. But certainly the 1 2 following timeline is relevant. 3 The initial beth din came back on September 25th and 4 ordered him to go to a beth din. 5 On October 1st, they were trying to install 6 antivirus software on their computer. 7 MR. SCHAFHAUSER: Beth din. 8 MR. NELKIN: Two Rivers. The QuickBooks plug-in or 9 some upgrade or something that needed to be done, and they 10 needed to have the IP person access the server. They were 11 locked out of the server. They asked for permission to get 12 this software put in. Mr. Friedman refused to give them the 13 password. Yossi he refused to give them the passwords. 14 On October 2nd -- he said that they needed to take 15 material off the --THE COURT: Forgive me for interrupting, I know 16 there's a much longer history that we're going to be debating. 17 18 I'm just talking about recently -- just if you focus in on the 19 last like during -- since the start of the hearing when access 20 has been restored temporarily to some extent. 21 I'm sorry, I thought you wanted me MR. NELKIN: 22 to --23 THE COURT: No, no, that's why I interrupted you. 24 Is there any evidence of wiping during this most

recent period since the hearing began?

25

Well, yes. 1 MR. NELKIN: 2 Okay, that's what I'm asking for. THE COURT: 3 So basically what the evidence shows is MR. NELKIN: 4 that several things. 5 One is, it shows the computers that were returned do 6 not appear to be the correct computers. 7 It appears that the computers themselves don't match 8 up with the time periods that they should match up with, based 9 on their starting dates and who the users were. 10 THE COURT: I'm talking about -- look, and we're 11 sort of going down this somewhat path because of what 12 Ms. Nelkin was saying about the timing of when access was 13 available and not available. 14 MR. NELKIN: So let me address the access points and 15 maybe that will help. 16 THE COURT: Just to focus the question I'm asking. I'm trying to understand if the implication you're asking me 17 18 to draw is that -- you are making is that wiping has -- the 19 access has been withdrawn to allow wiping during this period. 20 MR. NELKIN: Well, if nothing else, Mr. Schafhauser 21 just told us that the system that is on right now is not the 22 system that used to be on there, so --2.3 THE COURT: Yes. 24 MR. NELKIN: -- we know that there's a different 25 system, which does not explain exactly, but Stroz hasn't been

able to investigate that.

THE COURT: Look I am extremely troubled by what's in this letter. I don't intend to reach any conclusion until I have had a chance to hear from your adversaries. I'm trying to understand your model of what happened and I want to frame it this way:

Is this submission and the one I guess yesterday or Monday, I forget, we've had a couple of submissions from Stroz where based on access that you have since the start of these proceedings to Launch you've been able to detect what I appear to characterize as exfoliation or wiping and so on. And so the question arises: If they are intentionally frustrating your access to information, why are they letting you get at some of the information that will allow you to discover wiping?

MR. NELKIN: One of the things that we were interested in investigating and getting access to Launch, which we have not had during the course of the proceedings, we only had access for a very short period of time, like an hour or two.

THE COURT: Right. Why would you get that hour or two, you get damming evidence?

MR. NELKIN: Well, one of our theories was is that we wanted to go on the site and compare it against things that we might have observed before the case was filed on the Launch

system to see if there had been wiping.

But we simply have not had access to the Launch system for months, and we don't have any ability right now to tell you that it's the same data or that it hasn't been adjusted, and Stroz doesn't have any ability to do it unless they can get access to the underlying material. And even then I'm not sure if it's simply then something that has been crafted and created and plugged into a new system. Meaning if they altered the data beforehand and then loaded it on to a new server, then what --

THE COURT: So in other words, in an effort to -and I'm not assuming any of this is true, I'm trying to
articulate the theory I think you're identifying not
validating.

But in an effort to stay in compliance, they're putting something up online and making it available but in a way that does not successfully mask the prior spoliation.

Is that basically it?

MR. NELKIN: Basically.

MS. NELKIN: And, Your Honor, I don't mean to interrupt -- and Jay can address this better than I can -- but I believe that the historical evidence will show that these computers -- for example, we had a hearing, and I don't remember the exact date, July 5th or the 6th -- the computers were accessed and they were not supposed to have been accessed

the day before a hearing before this Court. That's happened I believe more than once. So our suspicious are not just, you know, paranoia, they're based on --

THE COURT: Look, I'm not suggesting you're paranoid, I'm not suggesting you're right or wrong, I'm trying to identify — it's a complicated area, I'm trying to identify the theories you're advancing and clearing up my own confusion. That's all.

MR. NELKIN: But to respond. What Stroz has been following here was what they were able to accomplish simply before they were cut off from the system that apparently is not the same as the original system based on Mr. Schafhauser's representation.

However, we have no confidence that the data had not been manipulated or that it wasn't taken down for other purposes and then being restored.

But I think it's also important to note that the way that we've been denied access to it keeps changing. We first -- Stroz and us were first denied access -- the way that you have to get in is you have to go through a remote login, and then you have to -- then once you're there, go into the login for the Launch system.

Initially we were given passwords, I think there's a submission, Your Honor, neither Stroz nor I could get on; they tried all different things. We took that up with the

defendants. After some period of time they changed some 1 2 password setting. We were able to get through to the VPN. 3 were able to get on Launch, but it crashed when you went to 4 data. 5 We took that up with them. Again they told us there 6 was a problem on their side, something to do with some sort of 7 antivirus software that they had was the claim. 8 THE COURT: All of this that you're telling me, this 9 is after the fee issue was resolved, ves? 10 This is while we've been in court. MR. NELKIN: 11 THE COURT: Okay. 12 MR. NELKIN: The second time. 13 THE COURT: Okay. 14 MR. NELKIN: They told us --15 THE COURT: I want -- sorry, this has got me with so 16 many questions. The antivirus, I remember hearing about that 17 yesterday, and apparently that's not what the problem is. 18 19 Who first said anything about the problem being 20 antivirus software? 21 MR. NELKIN: Akiva Goldfarb told me that. 22 THE COURT: That's Mr. Nussbaum's lawyer. 2.3 MR. NELKIN: Mr. Nussbaum's lawyer. 24 The history was when we had trouble getting on the

first time with the passwords, we sat here for half an hour,

25

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- 1448 Mr. Nussbaum tried to get access on his end, kept being delayed and kept having delayed conference calls and, ultimately, they would get on until the system crashed when we got on. Then we came back, told him about that. They told us that it was antivirus and it would take a day or two to resolve. We do that. We get on for maybe an hour or so through the VPN. We come to the Court and we tell the Court that we have found evidence that we'd like to take a recess for. We go home. I was able to log on the system for maybe five minutes, and then I got kicked off. And when I
 - tried to go back on, I no longer had access through the password or the VPN.

Stroz had the exact same thing. They were on, they were looking at stuff, it kicked them off, and then when they tried to log back in, the VPN wouldn't let them in at all.

So it sounds to Stroz and to us as if someone had gone in and intentionally kicked you off and then blocked the password.

Right, and the inference most readily THE COURT: drawn is the attempts to log in provides an alert to someone or something monitoring it, and the response is that --

MR. NELKIN: Stroz has told us that whoever is doing it, it's on their computer, they can see everything that we

1 do, they can see every record, and apparently there is an 2 ability to --3 THE COURT: Okay. MR. NELKIN: -- to alter data, if you were so 4 5 interested. 6 MS. NELKIN: Or to see who's on and what they're 7 doing and if you're in the place where they don't want you to 8 be... 9 MR. NELKIN: And there is one more aspect to the 10 system that you should be aware of is: From the very earliest 11 days there has been an administrator password to the system 12 that's never been provided to us. It appears to provide even 13 greater access than Sonia's password, which is the highest 14 level that we've ever been given. Sonia's password gives you 15 more access than Mr. Schreiber. What they've told us is if you log in as 16 17 Mr. Schreiber, you will only have restricted access; if you 18 log in as Sonia, you will have more. But there appears to be 19 administrator, and administrator provides you with far broader 20 access than Sonia's. 21 MR. SCHAFHAUSER: Your Honor, to the extent that 22 Mr. Nelkin and Ms. Nelkin are saying that they were prejudiced 23 last night, and I don't know whether that's the assertions

and, obviously, the Court will tell us how it wishes to

24

25

proceed.

But if the argument is that they were prejudiced, I wanted to see the same information that I've heard about in court. I have -- and I told counsel before Your Honor came out on the bench this morning, depending on what plaintiff wishes to do, I have no issue with -- if they believe they need more time to review the data that I hope is now fully available, and that I expect and understand will be fully available, I have no issues proceeding as the Court wishes. That's number one.

Number two, with respect, very briefly, to what I received, as the Court did a couple of hours ago, there's a lot in here. We will need to respond, and it's my expectation that we will need to hear from Stroz, who has I think now has submitted three reports, the Court hasn't heard from Stroz. We will, very likely, have to submit the defendant's testimony — and I spoke with Mr. Finkel, whose client was prominently mentioned in this document as well — we will need to submit testimonial evidence in response to these assertions as well as potentially to conduct our own forensic analysis in response to what's —

THE COURT: What you want to do, some of it sounds time consuming, and every moment that passes, things that should have happened in December remain undone. That's one of my concerns.

I want to make sure there is appropriate process for

all of this, but I weigh that against the concern that from 1 2 what I've seen so far -- obviously, I haven't seen 3 everything -- there seems to be significant and continuing 4 noncompliance with Court orders. And I'm troubled, and not 5 just about that appearance, but also about how best to 6 vindicate everybody's legitimate interests under these 7 circumstances. So let's take it step by step. 8 Today, is there anybody who thinks that we all benefit from continuing with the development of witness 9 10 testimony on the hearing which we have gathered. 11 My sense is that there are other things on each side 12 that you need to be doing and that what we've been doing here 13 has been, in some sense, overtaken by events. 14 So, again, I'm open to suggestions, but I want to 15 know if anybody thinks that anybody's purpose is best served by continuing with developing testimony today? 16 17 Your Honor, our next witness that we MS. NELKIN: 18 were going to call was Steven Schreiber. He has a little bit 19 to add but nothing that I think comes close to the issues that

are being addressed now, and I think it would be counterproductive.

20

21

22

23

24

25

I'm much more concerned about where are these computers that have been identified and how to best preserve those and to even know where they are. Certainly a much more serious issue than most of the testimony we've already heard,

1 Your Honor.

THE COURT: Well, I've heard most of the plaintiff's testimony, the defendant's in a moment.

But the other thing is, to the extent that there is testimony that hasn't yet been presented, and Mr. Schafhauser alluded to this a moment ago, it won't affect the testimony I've already heard, it maybe that before I can resolve the issues that are coming up, some witnesses are going to have to come back on the stand. So I think that any testimony you would develop today, we have to revisit in any event after you've done what you're going to do.

So my suggestion, and I want to hear from you as well, from all of you, anybody think that we should be continuing with the development of evidence today?

MR. SCHAFHAUSER: Your Honor, I — and I said this to Ms. Nelkin before, I'm happy either way. As truth be told, I was prepared to examine Mr. Schreiber days ago. But in the light of what happened with respect to access to Launch, and in light of what I understood and appreciated was an assertion that there was a prejudice to the plaintiff in getting on last night, I don't know oppose whatever applications she's making for more time, and all I'm saying is that whenever we reconvene, it would be my goal, after plaintiff rests, to present evidence in response to what Your Honor has seen.

THE COURT: Yes. Okay. There's that, and, again,

I'm looking at all the defendants, if you want to be the spokesperson --

MR. SCHAFHAUSER: I really shouldn't be the spokesperson, I'll sit.

THE COURT: No, no, anybody weigh in, but in addition to, obviously, cross-examining Mr. Schreiber when he testifies and putting on the evidence that you may want to develop in response to this morning's submission, was anybody planning to present evidence the remainder of this hearing today, you know, affirmative evidence on defendant's side?

MR. SCHAFHAUSER: What I -- yes, except what I

had -- Your Honor had asked me a few days ago who I was intending to call.

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. SCHAFHAUSER: And I think I mentioned Mr. Papa,
Mr. Schreiber, and Mr. Koenig, who I believe I see in the back
of the courtroom.

We've heard from Mr. Papa. I don't believe that we're going to need to recall him. Your Honor has heard extensively from him. Mr. Schreiber is being called by plaintiff, whenever that occurs, and depending on what is elicited through Mr. Schreiber's testimony, there may or may not be a need to call Mr. Koenig. You know, they're all members of the same entity, so I don't need to ask the same questions many times.

THE COURT: To the extent you want to put on 1 2 affirmative evidence on your side, is it about the issue of 3 plaintiff's compliance with their obligations under the preliminary injunction? 4 5 MR. SCHAFHAUSER: Yes, I will also want to do that 6 as well, particularly in light of -- particularly in light of 7 these allegations that have been made through these 8 submissions, I will want to put in evidence as well about, 9 frankly, what I read this morning about some of these 10 computers and where they are and who they belong to and so on. Anyone else? 11 THE COURT: 12 MR. SCHAFHAUSER: And if they -- go ahead. 13 Mr. Finkel --And even if Stroz is right, Stroz may 14 MR. FINKEL: 15 be wrong and these other phantom computers, if you will, may 16 not really exist. 17 And the testimony that you heard, for example, from 18 my client may well prove to be, and I think will prove to be, 19 truthful. There were two computers, not more. And that has 20 to be explained. 21 And so from my perspective, I think I would adopt 22 Your Honor's suggestion, I think proceeding with additional 23 testimony right now is not the core step we should take. 24 THE COURT: The one caveat that I'm trying to clear

up, I call it the defense side: Are there issues separate

25

- from the computer issues, or broadly stated, access to Launch,
 who had what computer; are there other issues on your side
 which you're seeking relief that you were going to present
 evidence?
 - MR. SCHAFHAUSER: I was and, again, in part, I think I've already done that. The issues that we were going to present, and Your Honor has heard about, was the information. We take the position that under the operating agreement Mr. Friedman is entitled to certain things.

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. SCHAFHAUSER: And I think Your Honor has heard that, and to some degree -- and I said this before, to some degree I'm prepared to address that in writing. Your Honor, can read the operating agreement and read the orders and make your determination.

THE COURT: Right. That's fair.

I know that you've got some submissions on your side, and I think they can be addressed without need for a factual determination -- you have a factual resolution disputed issue.

MR. SCHAFHAUSER: I don't think there's many issues in dispute. The facts are certain pieces of paper were presented and certain pieces of paper were not presented, I don't think there's really much dispute about that. Your Honor has heard the testimony on those points. And the same

1 with the payments. 2 Anyone else on the defense side before I THE COURT: 3 come back to plaintiffs? 4 Okay, Ms. Nelkin. 5 MS. NELKIN: Your Honor, I didn't know if 6 Mr. Schafhauser was going to go into his clients, because it's 7 our position that there's no motion. 8 THE COURT: Well, I think there's a motion pending, 9 it may not be exactly congruent with the issues that he's 10 talking about, but there's no motion on defense side, 11 certainly. 12 I'm sorry, the one other thing, as MR. SCHAFHAUSER: 13 they were talking, I -- the other issue, Your Honor, that has 14 been overlaid on this, is there has been a number of 15 discussions, I don't know whether this is part of the 16 motion -- I think there actually is a motion on the docket 17 that I filed, and I think there is another motion that 18 Mr. Nelkin and Ms. Nelkin filed that relates to the issue of

discussions, I don't know whether this is part of the motion — I think there actually is a motion on the docket that I filed, and I think there is another motion that Mr. Nelkin and Ms. Nelkin filed that relates to the issue of electronic discovery. I don't know whether this is part of the hearing, but I'm just raising it since we're, in essence, talking about open issues; electronic discovery, and ESI protocol, search terms, and exchange of documents during discovery. I don't know whether plaintiff's position is that that's part of this motion or should be separately addressed. But that has been out there, is out there, there are motions

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

pending, it's not clear to me whether they are technically part of this evidentiary hearing.

THE COURT: Well, I don't think so, only because there's not facts in dispute, I think.

MR. SCHAFHAUSER: What I'm suggesting to Your Honor is that Judge Amon on May -- I'm sorry, March 9th entered an order directing, among other things, that document production proceed with between both sides and that Mr. Friedman should sit for a deposition.

The document production, there's been disputes between the parties about a number of things; one of which had been a protective order. Your Honor has entered a protective order, and at least as to the images.

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. SCHAFHAUSER: That's the imaged computers. So the protective order remains an issue as well as ESI.

That issue, the resolution of those two issues will allow both sides to exchange in document production, as Judge Amon directed.

MR. BERGSON: I just want to make sure that it's clear that it's not been documents, it's internal devices.

THE COURT: No, you've all been quite voluble in making that point repeatedly. No, it's not lost on me. In fact, I was going to get to it.

MS. NELKIN: Judge Orenstein, in addition to what

Mr. Schafhauser just said, we count as part of our motion the 1 2 fact that we asked for certain documents in a subpoena dues 3 Tecum to Mr. Friedman's notice of deposition, which he did not 4 produce. We think that the issue of the computers and what 5 we're dealing with in this hearing is a primary concern. 6 We've been prepared to turn over documents, and 7 Mr. Schafhauser is correct, we've never been able to agree, because every time we try and reconfirm, there's some other 8 9 issue that's brought up. 10 My position would be, yes, we need to address all of 11 those document productions, but I don't want these computers 12 to get weathered. 13 THE COURT: Okay, look, we're going to talk about a 14 schedule for next time, but I want to talk about some 15 substantive things that I think we need to have an understanding going forward. This may be a little scattered, 16 17 so please forgive me. 18 But we need to develop the information about the 19 computers, we need to continue to work on restoring full 20 access to every version of Launch, and making sure that the 21 data is there, and that's the priority. And we'll talk about 22 the schedule for the next steps, you know, what next step 23 happens when.

result of this hearing have become clear, issues that need to

But there's some other things that I think as a

24

25

be resolved.

One is -- and a lot of this actually became apparent in Mr. Papa's testimony. There was questions about documents that were sent to Mr. Papa but counsel hadn't seen or vice versa. And, look, it's a fraught situation where the partners are locked in a dispute and they have a business that needs to continuing running and Mr. Papa is responsible for making sure that happens.

I think it would make sense, please tell me if anybody disagrees, that direct communications between any of the principals in terms of just providing documents, I'm not purporting to say there shouldn't be any direct communications in terms of phone calls, you know, for day-to-day matters. But in terms of documents that Mr. Papa needs, I think they should be coming from counsel rather than from one of the defendants directly to Mr. Papa so that we don't have any disconnect between what Mr. Papa understands he has and what counsel is getting.

Anybody disagree with that?

MR. SCHAFHAUSER: No disagreement, Your Honor.

MS. NELKIN: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right, so please going forward let's do it that way.

The other is -- and this may be more controversial, but actually this gets at two related areas: The issue of

counsel for Two Rivers, and Mr. Papa's ability to do
transactions and take certain actions on behalf of the company
as a person that everybody agrees to one person for the
company.

The operating agreement unambiguously gives certain rights to the partners, including the right to consent to certain actions. The preliminary injunction entered later, in consent of all the parties, prohibits any defendants from interfering with the operations of Two Rivers. And I think those two provisions can be intentioned in certain respects.

With respect to counsel, Mr. Papa made it quite clear in a couple of different ways in his testimony that the company needs to have counsel. It's a necessity not a luxury. I think actually one of the defendant's counsel elicited that.

So as I understand the preliminary injunction, as far as what he needs to do to run it, and the defendants can't impede that. That said, the operating agreement requires consent.

So I think the way I've written that is if Mr. Papa wants to retain counsel on behalf of the company going forward, not just for purposes of his testimony today, he solicits consent. If the consent is withheld and he comes to me and says the lack of consent is impeding the company, it's a violation of the preliminary injunction, and I or Judge Amon will hear from counsel on that issue. But it's hard for me to

see how withholding consent for Two Rivers to have counsel is impeding the operations.

The flip side of that, Two Rivers is doing other transactions, we heard about those two machines for 400, \$500,000 each, a couple other things that came up, that appear to, under the operating agreement, be a source of things for which Mr. Friedman's consent be required, Mr. Papa wasn't seeking it. And, again, this is of part why the company needs counsel, because he was making some assumptions of how the preliminary injunction works and not seeking that consent.

I don't see anything under the preliminary injunction that frees Mr. Papa, acting on behalf of the company, from letting Mr. Friedman know, giving him a chance to be heard, and I understood his testimony to be that Mr. Friedman wasn't interested in weighing in on some of these things, I'm not going to resolve that issue.

But it does seem to me that the safest course of conduct going forward for things that Mr. Papa thinks need to be done on behalf of the company, that under the operating agreement would require the consent of the partners is to solicit consent and it's denied, come back to court and say they're impeding the operations.

Sort of two layered-issues I wanted to run by you. Anybody have thoughts on that?

MS. NELKIN: Your Honor, I think the framework in

general that you're talking about is fine. I think that there are a couple of things that need to be said, and I'm not the counsel for the company, Mr. Rosenblatt is here, but who's substituting for Mr. Parness who is, I think, on a speaking engagement in Europe, so I may be more familiar with the situation.

It would be my opinion that the third amendment to the operating agreement only requires consent of all the parties for very specific enumerated things, and I think what you're talking about is perfectly reasonable, that there's no reason why Mr. Friedman's consent can't be solicited on those things.

I'm not certain -- it would be our position that the hiring of counsel is not an enumerated thing in that paragraph that requires unanimous consent.

THE COURT: I'm not saying it is, I know that's an issue in dispute.

MS. NELKIN: Yes, I understand. And I honestly, I don't know if purchasing the machinery falls in that category or not. I think for those things that are enumerated there's no problem with what you're suggesting.

There is the additional problem, however, that in violation of the operating agreement, Mr. Friedman is running a competing company, and Mr. Heller is frequently talking about the proprietary interest of 26 Flavors and Office Coffee

Service. Well, Two Rivers has those shows same proprietary interests and Mr. Friedman, in violation of that operating agreement, is, you know, he has a foot in both camps. So communicating with him on major decisions is somewhat of a

problem that is caused by Mr. Friedman's action.

2.3

So depending on what it is, I mean Two Rivers can't really give a competitor the authority to block them, for example, from purchasing machinery that Mr. Papa says is a necessity.

THE COURT: No, I get that and so here's what I have in mind that I think would -- just let me finish this thought, sorry, that I'm struggling with it -- that I think would help resolve the tension.

If it's something that the company needs to do, generally, tell Mr. Friedman if he withholds consent or says that he has to apply consent and he's withholding it from the company, the company comes to Court and says he violated the preliminary injunction, we resolve that.

If there's a reason that even giving him notice of the intended action would put Two Rivers at a competitive risk, you can always ask for leave to make — the company ask for leave to make an ex parte application, and we take it from there.

MR. NELKIN: Your Honor.

THE COURT: I'm sorry, just one last thing.

PROCEEDINGS

	PROCEEDINGS						
1	THE COURT: Okay.						
2	MR. NELKIN: And there is a 6.12, and there's a						
3	second one that I'm looking for, if you'd give me a second						
4	while you all are reading that one that I think is also						
5	relevant.						
6	THE COURT: 6.12 is majority of members can						
7	authorize day-to-day management and operations.						
8	MR. NELKIN: Yes, correct.						
9	THE COURT: Neither of which describes retaining						
10	counsel or buying major machinery.						
11	MR. NELKIN: There's a separate one for the						
12	retaining of counsel. I'm just looking for it right here. It						
13	says that they are allowed to contract it's the one that						
14	they cite that they tried to get us disqualified for. As long						
15	as you're not a relative.						
16	I'm looking for it. It has to do with hiring						
17	outside contractors. It's cited in our I'm just trying to						
18	find it now.						
19	MR. SCHAFHAUSER: If it will help you, it is on						
20	page 4 of the third amendment as I read it, section it's in						
21	the middle of the third page, paragraph 8, which is an						
22	amendment to Section 6.1.2. It's Subsection B.						
23	MR. NELKIN: That's the problem. I was on the						
24	wrong amendment.						

THE COURT: It's amendment 3, page 4.

PROCEEDINGS

MR. SCHAFHAUSER: Page 4, your Honor, and it's Subsection B.

THE COURT: Got it. All decisions relating to staffing, employment and independent contract work for the company shall be made only upon the consent of the majority of the members per capita except hiring of family members and any member shall require the unanimous consent of the members.

MR. NELKIN: Judge McCormick in Middlesex actually said that that authorized the other members to hire counsel without Mr. Friedman.

THE COURT: Yeah.

MR. SCHAFHAUSER: Your Honor, that is an issue that has been in dispute, but you heard what I was asking Mr. Papa as well. Frankly, we're being asked, on the one hand, to consent on an issue in dispute in which my client takes the position is an arbitrable issue.

But number two, on the other hand, Mr. Papa, I gather, has -- not Mr. Papa, Two Rivers has retained counsel for other matters without consent not only by Mr. Friedman, but without consent by plaintiff. So under this provision that counsel just pointed to, even under the per capita, it's two out of four members, it wouldn't even apply what your Honor has just been saying.

THE COURT: Look, if you want to take action against Mr. Papa, the person you've entrusted to run this company,

you're going to do it. I'm not saying you can or can't.

What I'm saying is, going forward, the company needs

counsel. And to the extent that Mr. Friedman thinks that he

can block that from happening by withholding consent

consistent with this agreement for the moment, I'm not

interpreting the agreement to resolve that issue. I do

question whether withholding consent would violate the

MR. SCHAFHAUSER: I understand. And I've heard -- and I understand it.

preliminary injunction.

THE COURT: And so I think going forward -- you know, look, my -- one of my goals generally is to avoid prematurely deciding an issue without -- and the issue of whether the company needs counsel or can't have counsel may not be premature at this point, but it seems to me that there's no doubt anymore that it's a necessity. To the extent that he's got rights to withhold consent, that implicates paragraph 4 of the preliminary injunction.

So I'm asking all of you going forward, consult on these major matters to see if there's a dispute. Now, if there's a reason for competitive reasons — and I get it, right. Two Rivers is in business. It's competing with another company that Mr. Friedman has an interest in.

MR. HELLER: Your Honor, can I just address -THE COURT: You may not interrupt me.

PROCEEDINGS

1 MR. HELLER: I'm sorry. 2 To the extent that Two Rivers needs to THE COURT: 3 take action in its competitive interest that would be 4 prejudiced by disclosing it to somebody who has an interest in 5 a competitor, I think the solution is to come to court for 6 permission to act ex parte consistent with the preliminarily injunction. But absent the need to do so ex parte to avoid 7 8 prejudice, I think it should be on notice and if consent is 9 withheld, we litigate that here. 10 Judge Orenstein, the only thing that I MS. NELKIN: 11 have some concern about with what you're suggesting -- and 12 maybe to Two Rivers it won't be this way, but to me it's 13 rather vaque in my mind as to what matters fall under this 14 framework that you're talking about. This is a large company 15 that is selling a lot of coffee to grocers and whatever --16 THE COURT: All the more reason. Sorry to

THE COURT: All the more reason. Sorry to interrupt. I'm not going to resolve that now. I can't.

MS. NELKIN: I'm sorry.

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

acting on behalf of Two Rivers to say to both sides here,
here's what we need to do without having to go through a fight
among the litigating parties, just to keep the doors open and
the business running. If anybody thinks that that shouldn't
happen, come to court and we'll resolve it.

MS. NELKIN: The thing that I'm concerned about

from Two Rivers' standpoint is, you know, they are not going to want to be bothering you every minute and they are not going to want to be for every decision that they make having to wonder if it's one that they have to deal with this way.

THE COURT: Right. That's why I'm saying counsel for Two Rivers -- you're speaking on behalf of somebody you don't represent.

MS. NELKIN: That's true.

THE COURT: Counsel for Two Rivers should be -- look, I think most of this is covered by the operating agreement anyway. The day-to-day operations just don't need to have this kind of consent. To the extent that there are things that don't happen every day and there's a gray area between day-to-day operations and major decisions, which is also spelled out in the operating agreement, I think in the first instance counsel for Two Rivers should try and sketch out, you know, what kinds of things those are and get some clarity in the preliminary injunction, if not an agreement between counsel as to what kind of input and/or consent is necessary.

MR. NELKIN: Would it be helpful, perhaps, if we could reach an agreement as to a dollar amount threshold or something?

THE COURT: It might. But look, once again,
Mr. Nelkin, neither you nor Ms. Nelkin, you don't represent

	PROCEEDINGS							
1	Two Rivers.							
2	MR. NELKIN: No, no, I was just speaking on behalf							
3	of my client.							
4	THE COURT: Right. We need to get Two Rivers to be							
5	able to operate and that is the point, much of the point, of							
6	the preliminary injunction, to maintain the viability of Two							
7	Rivers which you all have an interest. You need to keep it							
8	running, keep it as a healthy company. It needs to have							
9	counsel to negotiate with all of you what does and doesn't							
10	require consent from some or all of the partners or court							
11	intervention.							
12	MR. SCHAFHAUSER: Your Honor, at an appropriate							
13	interval, could we take a five-minute break?							
14	THE COURT: Let's do that now.							
15	MR. SCHAFHAUSER: Thank you.							
16	(Recess taken at 10:45a.m.)							
17	MR. SCHAFHAUSER: Your Honor							
18	MR. ROSENBLATT: On behalf of Two Rivers, if I may,							
19	your Honor, I appreciate the recognition that the company does							
20	in fact need counsel. The concern is that and just I come							
21	to this case as new as anybody.							
22	THE COURT: Yes.							
23	MR. ROSENBLATT: But it's already very clear that							
24	any major decision will be contentious and will result in							
25	being hailed into court.							

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

PROCEEDINGS

The concern is that Two Rivers is going to be hailed into court all the time, and it needs to make important decisions and that's going to impede their business. We will endeavor to identify those type of things by speaking to Mr. Papa and the members of the LLC about the types of things that the company does, and we will try to anticipate what needs to be done and what decisions may need consent. We'll try to work it out with counsel.

I wanted to make your Honor aware of that, but that is a concern.

THE COURT: Of course it's a concern but, look, I think if you sit down around the table, you know, counsel for the plaintiff, counsel for Mr. Friedman, and you or Mr. Parness, there are some things that are quite clearly day-to-day operations and under the operating agreement nobody can really say that the partners have to -- the members have to weigh in, some things that are clearly, you know, dissolving the business, clearly major decisions, explicitly so under the agreement yet -- that are gray area. Mr. Papa in particular seems to have, you know, the experience of at least the last, you know, eight months or so, if not longer, to -- and you guys have the experience of, you know, testimony and the experience of your clients in the business, to put on the table things that you think fall into the gray area. If you can agree on what does and doesn't require

PROCEEDINGS consent, great. If there's, for instance, specific types of 1 2 things that in a planning meeting you identify as being in 3 dispute, you can come back for some clarification, right. 4 So hopefully we can get past a lot of the potential 5 disputes early on. 6 MR. ROSENBLATT: And we will endeavor to do that. Ι 7 just want to make it clear. 8 THE COURT: I think far better for all concerned, 9 particularly the company, if such areas that are in dispute 10 are addressed in advance rather than post hoc. 11 MR. ROSENBLATT: Understood. Thank you. 12 Your Honor, if I may? MR. SCHAFHAUSER: THE COURT: Yes. 13 14 During the recess I consulted, MR. SCHAFHAUSER: 15 and my client -- I'm speaking carefully because I need to 16 assert a position clearly and carefully. 17 THE COURT: Yes. My client does not object to the 18 MR. SCHAFHAUSER: 19 appointment of counsel for Two Rivers for the litigation with 20 two qualifiers and caveats. 21 The first is that -- and it's the same caveat that I 22 put on the record the other day -- he has a position under the

The first is that -- and it's the same caveat that I put on the record the other day -- he has a position under the operating agreement. He has a position with respect to the pending motion for Judge Amon. My client would be agreeing without waiver of any rights, without prejudice to his

23

24

positions of his rights under the operating agreement and otherwise. That would be the first --

THE COURT: Can I respond to that?

MR. SCHAFHAUSER: Of course.

THE COURT: It essentially has nothing to do with this litigation and therefore doesn't even implicate waiver. It's, as among the partners, it makes it clear that he's providing consent for Two Rivers to have counsel.

MR. SCHAFHAUSER: Okay. The second -- well, really, his position is that it would be not really a settlement, but it would be a way of resolving an issue that has caused friction in this case. That's what -- he would be consenting to the appointment of counsel essentially to resolve an issue of dispute. And that's why I make the anti-waiver comment for whatever significance that has.

The second point is that your Honor had directed us to -- when I say "us," me and counsel for the plaintiff, a couple of months ago to meet and confer. We did meet and confer. We exchanged lists of names. I gave, I think, three names. Ms. Nelkin gave me three names. We went back and forth. We didn't -- unfortunately, we didn't reach an agreement.

Mr. Parness was on the list that plaintiff had provided. And actually I think both of these lists were submitted to your Honor in the letters. I think the parties,

most respectfully, are at an impasse as to who that independent counsel should be.

THE COURT: I'm going to defer to Mr. Papa on that.

MR. SCHAFHAUSER: I would respectfully submit that your Honor can appoint counsel that the Court sees fit to represent -- defend the interests of Two Rivers.

of people in this room. I think I'm the least qualified to tell Two Rivers how to run its business and who it should hire and that sort of thing. If Mr. Papa is the point person that you've all agreed should be running this business while you try and resolve your disputes, if he's comfortable with Mr. Parness and Mr. Greenblatt, it's fine with me. I don't have an objection. I'm not going to try and override it.

If he wants to find somebody else, I'm not going to challenge that. It's ultimately the company's decision and I think since Mr. Papa is essentially handling the day-to-day operations, he's the one who needs to figure out who best to represent the company.

MR. SCHAFHAUSER: Except under the operating agreement, your Honor, it's not Mr. Papa's right to appoint counsel; it's the members' right to appoint counsel, as we just looked through the agreement. And in the absence of an agreement, there needs to be a way to resolve an impasse.

THE COURT: I'm proposing one. You said you want to

defer to me. Here's what I would do. I would say rather than 1 2 me pick out a lawyer that I don't know or choose between 3 somebody proposed by either litigant, I would trust Mr. Papa 4 whose testimony was refreshingly in this hearing in my mind 5 candid and straight forward. He seems to know what he's doing 6 and be acting in the interest of the company as an entity. 7 He's given me no reason to question his competence or his good 8 faith in this area. 9 So if you're deferring to me, I'm deferring to him. 10 Well, actually, the request was MR. SCHAFHAUSER: 11 that the Court independently appoint someone. 12 And the other issue --13 THE COURT: I'm doing that, I'm doing that, but I'm 14 telling you my methodology. 15 The other issue is that Mr. -- I MR. SCHAFHAUSER: 16 think I raised this when Mr. Parness was actually hear back in 17 early July. It's my understanding that Mr. Parness 18 represented either the company --19 (Brief pause.) 20 MR. SCHAFHAUSER: He represented Two Rivers before 21 he dealt with Mr. Friedman, among others. 22 THE COURT: If he's represented the company before, 23 all the more reason to think that he's got a duty of loyalty 24 to the company as an entity, not to anyone who is a litigant

25

in this case.

Case 1:15 cv 06861 CBA JO Document 331 Filed 11/02/16 Page 51 of 100 PageID #: 12743

PROCEEDINGS

Well, he, I believe, may have 1 MR. SCHAFHAUSER: 2 obtained information and have had communications with a 3 litigant in this case who happens to be a 60 percent majority 4 member of the company but now seems to be in an potentially 5 adverse position. 6 THE COURT: But he didn't represent Mr. Friedman 7 personally. 8 Look, to the extent he's had communications with 9 Mr. Friedman as counsel for the company, he would have 10 obtained information that is privileged under a privilege held 11 by the company. 12 MR. SCHAFHAUSER: It's not my understanding that he 13 represented Mr. Friedman personally. I'm not so asserting. 14 What I'm asserting -- and you see I'm whispering to my client, 15 I'm trying to get the facts, but what I understand is that in the course of representing the company, there were certain 16 matters that were disclosed to Mr. Parness. 17 18 The bottom line is we don't believe that 19 Mr. Parness -- and this is not a commentary on his ability or 20 his integrity, it's only a commentary on the unfortunate 21 impasse that we find ourselves -- we don't believe that he is 22 the appropriate person to represent --23 THE COURT: Okav. The fact that he's had 24 communications with Mr. Friedman or, as I assume -- I'm happy

to hear or not, you know, further on this -- I assume he's had

communications similarly with each of the members. And it 1 2 might be an issue if Two Rivers becomes a party to the 3 litigation adverse to Mr. Friedman or Mr. Schreiber or anyone 4 I'm talking about to the extent that Two Rivers has to 5 take actions vis-a-vis the rest of the world so that it can 6 operate its business and it needs counsel to be able to 7 undertake that mission, I don't see any reason why Mr. Papa 8 can't have Mr. Parness do that. 9 MR. SCHAFHAUSER: Again, the request that I was 10 asked to make was that your Honor appoint someone independently. That was a request. 11 12 THE COURT: Okay. 13 You're declining that request. MR. SCHAFHAUSER: 14 I'm declining to do so, that's correct. THE COURT: 15 The other item I wish to MR. SCHAFHAUSER: 16 address -- actually a couple items. The first is the 17 interplay between the operating agreement and the preliminary 18 injunction. And I understand and appreciate that your Honor 19 has said you're not making a determination today as to certain 20 issues. 21 THE COURT: I can't --22 MR. SCHAFHAUSER: Those are being held in abeyance. 23 I just need to put on the record that the operating agreement, 24 as your Honor has pointed out, provides certain rights.

preliminary injunction, we've all read it, I multiple times,

and it says certain things. If there is a dispute as to an issue as to consent, what we would propose to do is if that cannot be agreed upon, to bring it to your Honor's attention.

THE COURT: That's fine.

MR. SCHAFHAUSER: Because I certainly don't want to be -- I didn't mean to interrupt.

THE COURT: I interrupted you. Go ahead.

MR. SCHAFHAUSER: I'm sorry.

I certainly don't want to be in a position, nor do I want my client to be in a position, where -- and this is a purely hypothetical, that someone says let's buy the Taj Mahal, we think it's necessary. And he says, Mr. Friedman says, no, it's not necessary. And if he says no, then he's in violation of a preliminary injunction. What I would propose to do in that instance is to immediately present the issue or Two Rivers present the issue to your Honor.

THE COURT: If that wasn't clear in what I was saying, I meant it to be.

MR. SCHAFHAUSER: Thank vou.

THE COURT: Yes. But with one, I think, very important caveat.

You know, in my position as a magistrate judge, I can decide non-dispositive pretrial matters, but I can't order injunctive relief. So to the extent that any dispute that arises on the preliminary injunction could be resolved only by

PROCEEDINGS

the Court clarifying or entering some new provision into the injunction, it would have to come from Judge Amon. I am more than happy to have all of you come to me in the first instance if you think that's efficient so that I can either recommend a result that you can then take up to Judge Amon or agree that that's enough of a resolution, you know, for purposes of going forward. As long as we're all clear that anything that changes the injunction can only be recommended by me, can't be decided.

MR. SCHAFHAUSER: Understood. I appreciate that.

Your Honor, so I just need -- and I appreciate that. The next item that I wanted to address very briefly is your Honor's comments about information. The information -- if the members are getting information, I believe Mr. Friedman should be getting that same information under the operating agreement.

And very briefly, the comment was made that Mr. Friedman owns an interest in another company. Your Honor's heard the testimony; he owns interest in a number of entities. But I think we're talking here in this instance about 26 Flavors that counsel mentioned.

Well, 26 Flavors, again, as I think Mr. Heller was about to jump up and contest whether or not it's a truly competing business, and we need not address that; your Honor has enough on the Court's plate to address whether it's a

PROCEEDINGS

competing business or not. I'm just making the point that whether or not it's a competing business, the plaintiff sought and obtained information through these images, for instance, without — when the issue was raised as to whether any other parties had proprietary interest — and it was Mr. Heller who was pushing this point — plaintiff took the position that no segregation was needed for proprietary information so it's surprising to hear that all of a sudden proprietary information becomes necessary.

THE COURT: I'm truly surprised that you're going to make that argument and invite the very obvious response, but if that's what you want to go to bat on, by all means.

MR. SCHAFHAUSER: I'm not going to bat.

THE COURT: Because, look --

MR. SCHAFHAUSER: It was a prelude to a different point.

THE COURT: I'm going to deem that withdrawn unless you really want a full response.

MR. SCHAFHAUSER: I anticipate that Mr. Heller is going to make his own application on that point. But the prelude was really to this point: To the extent that before the TRO was entered whatever information was made available to Mr. Friedman then under the operating agreement, whether it was involving 26 flavors or whatever it was, it was good enough for years before the TRO was entered. And most

PROCEEDINGS

respectfully, I don't believe that TRO vitiated my client's right to information and to the payments set forth in the operating agreement.

2.3

THE COURT: It doesn't change the operating agreement, but it does change the status quo. It was entered into on consent, but these seven days of testimony have made it quite clear to me that there is a need to restrain Mr. Friedman from interfering with the operations of Two Rivers.

So to the extent that there is information about the operation of Two Rivers on the going-forward basis that if shared with Mr. Friedman could lead to action that's would prejudice Two Rivers, I don't see any reason why the Court can't exercise its injunctive powers to prevent it, notwithstanding the operating agreement.

And so I can't and wouldn't try to prejudge any such issue as it arises. What I'm saying is there needs to be a way going forward for the business to operate with as little prejudice to Mr. Friedman's right to information as possible. That doesn't preclude their right to come to the Court and say for this reason this information should not be shared, even though the operating agreement would normally make it available.

All I was suggesting was that before your Honor has an

Your Honor, I don't disagree.

MR. SCHAFHAUSER:

PROCEEDINGS

application before your Honor on a specific issue, the presumption should be that Mr. Friedman is entitled to the same information that the other members receive unless a showing is made to your Honor as to why a particular item of information should be -- I think your Honor said the word "in camera" or "ex parte," whatever the phrase was -- unless there is a showing that's made.

I think what your Honor just articulated is what I was trying to say in my own inarticulate way, which is that Mr. Friedman should be given the information to which he is presumptively entitled as a member under the operating agreement unless a showing is made to your Honor otherwise. That's what I respectfully submit.

THE COURT: I don't think we're saying different things.

Mr. Rosenblatt.

MR. ROSENBLATT: Your Honor, just I think a couple things. I mean, the first is with regard to the counsel issue, I don't know if you even want to hear me on that.

THE COURT: Look, what I've said is I'm deferring to Mr. Papa. There is an agreement, as I understand it, that the company can retain counsel. To the extent that anybody was saying I should decide, I am making no decision other than the company can hire counsel.

MR. ROSENBLATT: Thank you. I just find it ironic

that they asked your Honor to make a decision. Your Honor made a decision and then --

THE COURT: Okay. Look, we're past that issue.

MR. ROSENBLATT: But as to the information issue, I mean, as your Honor recognized, clearly Mr. Friedman has significantly competing interests here. We've heard testimony, at least I've heard, just from this week alone that gives rise to significant questions about information about Two Rivers' operations that Mr. Friedman should have access to considering he's working for a competitor. So obviously we would object to disclosure of information.

THE COURT: Well, look, I think this should be part of your conversations with the parties' counsels about, you know, same way as trying to map out going forward what requires consent and what doesn't. You know, there are going to be some areas of dispute. I think there can be -- it's not that difficult to map out types of information that can and should properly be shared and types of information about which you have a concern.

And, yes, if there is a dispute, come to court and it gets resolved.

MR. ROSENBLATT: We'll work on it, Judge.

THE COURT: Okay. But I don't think we can speculate about where the disputes are going to be. It's much better to put some flesh on the bone and have specific

disputes to resolve.

MR. ROSENBLATT: Thank you.

THE COURT: Mr. Heller.

MR. HELLER: Your Honor, a little context needs to be put in order. The only reason why Two Rivers is a competitor of 26 Flavors is because Two Rivers is acting in flagrant violation of a noncompete agreement that it had with 26 Flavors going back to 2012. These companies were not supposed to be in competition. My clients, 26 Flavors and Office Coffee Services, were distributors of these K-Cups or whatever they resemble. Two Rivers was supposed to be a manufacturer. Two Rivers began to compete against my client.

So that's some of the context that you need to understand. And that's part of the reason why we're here is because 26 Flavors took action against Two Rivers by bringing them to arbitration and also attempting to get a preliminary injunction in New Jersey which was denied but that arbitration, the only reason why it's not proceeding at this point is, A, because of this litigation and, B, because Two Rivers showed up and claimed it didn't have counsel and couldn't proceed.

Those things are subject to judicial --

THE COURT: That was the New Jersey proceeding where Mr. Friedman wouldn't consent to have them have counsel, correct?

Lisa S. Schwam, CRR, RPR, RMR
Official Court Reporter

PROCEEDINGS

1	MR.	HELLER:	That's	part	of	the	issue.	
---	-----	---------	--------	------	----	-----	--------	--

- THE COURT: Yes, okay. I got it.
- MR. HELLER: That's something that's outside of my
- 4 | control unfortunately.
- 5 THE COURT: Well, your control, meaning your
- 6 client.
- 7 MR. HELLER: My client.
- 8 THE COURT: In which Mr. Friedman is a member?
- 9 MR. HELLER: Mr. Friedman is a minority member in 26
- 10 Flavors.
- 11 THE COURT: Right. Okay. Got it.
- MR. HELLER: Okay. That's the context of this
- 13 | competition issue. Now, right now --
- 14 THE COURT: Do you understand how I'm having trouble
- 15 understanding how that isn't a problem essentially of the
- 16 | making of 26 Flavors in conjunction with Mr. Friedman? Do you
- 17 understand why that would be difficult for me to understand?
- 18 MR. HELLER: Well, only because your Honor has a
- 19 | particular opinion of Mr. Friedman which I can understand has
- 20 been generated throughout the last week, and I can understand
- 21 | that. So, you know, that's unfortunate. But I gotta say that
- 22 the fact that these companies are in competition is not a
- 23 fault of my client. And the fact that --
- 24 THE COURT: I'm sorry. It's not a matter of fault.
- 25 I'm nowhere near a point where I could assign fault for

PROCEEDINGS

- something. But I think it is a fact -- tell me if that's wrong -- that they are competing.
- MR. HELLER: It is a fact.
- 4 THE COURT: Yes.

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. HELLER: So that your Honor would understand,
they are not competing in every facet of the business. They
are only competing on the distribution side of this business.

THE COURT: Whatever they are competing on, you guys knows this better. But to the extent that Mr. Friedman has an interest in two competing businesses and is saying to one of them give me information about how you run your business, there's the obvious potential for a conflict of interest that would give the business competing with your client a reason to want to withhold some information. And all I'm doing is saying if that's a concern, we're going to have a process for resolving that.

Is there a problem with that?

MR. HELLER: I don't have a problem with that concept, your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. HELLER: But I just wanted to put everything into context. Unfortunately, context has not been something we've been able to do throughout this process.

THE COURT: That's a matter of opinion. I appreciate you adding your context to the record. Thank you.

1 MR. SCHAFHAUSER: Just quickly on what I heard from 2 Mr. Rosenblatt. 3 THE COURT: You both stood up at the same time. 4 assume you'll want to respond to both. 5 MS. NELKIN: Yes. 6 MR. SCHAFHAUSER: I apologize. 7 What I was proposing on my client's behalf was that 8 the Court appoint someone independent. If the Court is not 9 prepared to appoint someone independent, my client doesn't 10 wish to proceed with that proposal. 11 THE COURT: That's something I think we need to tee 12 up quickly. Because it's my view that withholding consent on 13 this record for Two Rivers to have counsel is in violation of 14 paragraph 4 of the preliminary injunction. 15 MR. SCHAFHAUSER: Very well. 16 THE COURT: To my mind, a willful violation. 17 So I'll be happy to write that up quickly as a 18 recommendation to Judge Amon that leaving all the other issues 19 unresolved, an appropriate sanction in addition to the remedy 20 of appointing counsel should be decided upon. 21 MR. SCHAFHAUSER: Again, Mr. Friedman's not 22 withholding consent to a counsel. It is the identity of the 23 counsel to which he respectfully objects, your Honor. 24 wishes the appointment of an independent counsel.

The Court is not appointing counsel.

THE COURT:

PROCEEDINGS

Two Rivers is hiring counsel. He can consent to that or he can object to it.

MR. SCHAFHAUSER: Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: Which is it?

MR. SCHAFHAUSER: I will need to confer with him the point your Honor has articulated. I appreciate your Honor's comments.

THE COURT: Yes.

MS. NELKIN: Your Honor, I think you have some understanding just by the attempt to reach a conclusion on this matter what my client has been dealing with. I just want to ask the Court to have some clarification as to what Mr. Friedman's consent to having the attorney means when he says I'm not waiving any of my rights. Because the whole problem that arose was that Mr. Friedman was arguing that the individual plaintiffs -- I'm sorry, they were not plaintiffs, they were actually defendants, that they should have to independently pay the attorneys' fees for Two Rivers because, as a partner, he was not willing to authorize counsel --

THE COURT: Look, you guys are fighting over money,

I get that, among other things. Two Rivers is running a

business, a business in which I assumed both of the individual

parties on opposite sides, Mr. Schreiber and Mr. Friedman,

have a shared interest in seeing it succeed. That's not

happening if it doesn't have counsel.

PROCEEDINGS

When it hires counsel, as it does when it buys a machine, when it pays a vendor bill, it spends money. It spends the money of Two Rivers. At some point you guys are going to be going through to the resolution of a fight over who is entitled to that money or responsible for paying into that budget. But the money comes from Two Rivers, I would assume, in the first instance, not from Mr. Friedman, not from Mr. Schreiber.

MR. SCHAFHAUSER: Agreed, your Honor.

exercise what he believes to be his right to withhold consent from Two Rivers hiring counsel. If Two Rivers says, wait, there's a gray area of whether we can hire counsel in the absence of consent, you'll come to court. If the Court concludes that, yeah, under the operating agreement consent is required and withholding that consent is in violation, then an appropriate remedy will be fashioned.

MR. SCHAFHAUSER: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: All of this falls by the wayside if, as I thought we had an agreement a few minutes ago, Two Rivers, like virtually any other operating company, is in a position to hire an attorney to represent it in settings where counsel is needed.

An example of which would be you issued a subpoena,
Mr. Schafhauser, to Two Rivers -- to Mr. Papa, intending it to

- 1 be for Two Rivers because that's what the documents are for.
- 2 That's why I was clarifying earlier about Mr. Papa
- 3 | individually. I didn't think it was directed to him despite
- 4 | the way it was written, but I wanted to make sure that that
- 5 wasn't a problem.
- 6 Had Two Rivers failed to discharge its obligations,
- 7 | maybe you think it did, it would have to face a show cause
- 8 | hearing to show why it shouldn't be held in contempt. It
- 9 | would be the lawyer to appear there. It couldn't appear at
- 10 | that hearing without counsel. A company needs counsel.
- So I would assume that members of a company want the
- 12 | company to have counsel just like it wants the company to have
- 13 | an accountant. If there's not consent for that and you think
- 14 | consent is required, we will take that up.
- 15 MR. SCHAFHAUSER: Your Honor, I understand and I
- 16 | appreciate it. My client's position -- I just want to say it
- 17 one more time because there's been back and forth on this. My
- 18 | client's position is not that he's refusing consent to an
- 19 attorney. It's that, most respectfully, that that attorney
- 20 | should be independent and not be someone who is participating
- 21 on, most respectfully, one side of the table in a proceeding
- 22 against him.
- 23 An example, a hand delivery is made of, among other
- 24 | things, mails to Mr. Papa. Instead of opening the mails, I
- 25 | thought I heard the testimony to be that the first priority

PROCEEDINGS

was to copy everything and disseminate it to others so that we could have an exhibit in this case, rather than attend to what was in the unopened mails.

THE COURT: I heard the same testimony that you did, and I think you're putting more of a gloss on it than it will support. He clearly, without the benefit of counsel, thought he needed to give it to counsel to preserve it for use in the litigation. Whether to favor one side or not, I did not get that in the slightest.

MR. SCHAFHAUSER: Okay. I don't mean to --

THE COURT: I gotta tell you, everyone who sat in that witness chair had a stake in this except Mr. Papa. I've gotta tell you, unlike every other witness, he was answering your questions and their questions with the same demeanor, the same level of cooperativeness.

One thing I'm without a doubt about is that Mr. Papa is an honest broker trying to keep the company running while you folks fight out who owns it.

MR. SCHAFHAUSER: Very well.

THE COURT: You've got a very uphill climb to persuade me that he's taking actions, Mr. Papa, to favor one side or another. But even if you're right, that example of him handling the mail that you delivered to him has nothing to do with how Mr. Parness and Mr. Greenblatt is acting or about their independence.

PROCEEDINGS

Look, Mr. Friedman is going to either consent to Two Rivers hiring counsel or not. I understand. You're trying to draw a distinction between Mr. Parness and Mr. Greenblatt, on the one hand, and some other lawyer on the other. I'm telling you my view is that's Two Rivers' decision to make. If you want to challenge it and disqualify someone, go, make the application.

MR. SCHAFHAUSER: Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: Please let me know if there's something that I need to take up with Judge Amon in terms of making a recommendation.

MR. SCHAFHAUSER: And I will. Needless to say, I need to consult with my client. I will.

THE COURT: Okay. You'll consult. Let's try and wrap up as much as we can here.

One last issue, and I trust this will be a lot less contentious than the one we've been dealing with the last several minutes, one of the just operational difficulties that I was hearing from Mr. Papa's testimony and some of the others arises from the fact that the corporate address and the address to which a lot of mail was being sent is

Mr. Friedman's residence and yet the preliminary injunction imposes some real restrictions on what he can do. He can't even go within a thousand feet of it certain any circumstances.

1 Is there any reason why the mailing address and the 2 corporate address can't be switched officially to the Two 3 Rivers office? Just so that Mr. Papa isn't waiting, you know, 4 for mail that's going to Mr. Friedman. 5 MR. SCHAFHAUSER: The answer is we don't have an 6 objection. I'm trying to understand what the facts are. 7 (Brief pause.) 8 MR. SCHAFHAUSER: Again, I'm relaying information. 9 THE COURT: Do you want to take a break? That was 10 the last thing on my agenda. 11 MR. SCHAFHAUSER: My understanding from what I've 12 just been told is that the mails have been switched. 13 insofar as they haven't and, listen, I delivered the mail 14 because I learned about mail, right. Needless to say, when I 15 learned about it, I delivered it. Insofar as those mailings, 16 which we did not open, by the way, for obvious reasons, 17 insofar as those mailings indicate that certain people still 18 have his home address, I don't believe -- we don't object. 19 THE COURT: So again, that's something --20 MR. SCHAFHAUSER: We can cooperate on that. 21 have no need to receive mail at home. It's only a complicated 22 factor for all of us. 23 THE COURT: Right. So there's the mail issue. 24 I guess one just came to mind, belated, is the New Jersey 25 Department of Labor has records being kept at Mr. Devine's

1 office, I think, which --

To the extent that the company is on record with New Jersey as saying we're keeping our records with Mr. Devine and that's not the case, I think that needs to be changed as well, right?

MR. FELDMAN: That's fine. That was just a permit allowing him.

THE COURT: Right. All I'm saying is to the extent that one of the issues that's arising is people outside the company thinking that the place to look for records or to send things for the company is Mr. Devine or Mr. Friedman's residence, that's guaranteed to cause problems down the road so let's try and resolve those things.

MR. FELDMAN: Agreed.

THE COURT: Mr. Nelkin.

MR. NELKIN: Yeah. Your Honor, I believe, and
Mr. Schafhauser or Mr. Friedman can correct me if I'm wrong,
but I believe that there still is some bank accounts for
things like Signature Bank that may remain open. And I
believe those account statements may still be going to
Mr. Friedman. Not to his house but to some other address.

THE COURT: Okay. But make sure -- look, anything that's a Two Rivers account, mailing address, anything, it should be going to Two Rivers' office so that Mr. Papa can deal with it rather than any of the litigants.

MR. NELKIN: There's an official registration and they need his consent to get that.

THE COURT: Guys, we're not going to track down every instance of this. I'm trying to give you the general principle and ask you to pay attention to it so you can avoid problems in the future.

Last thing before we take a break so you can consult with your client, Mr. Schafhauser, we just need to have some next steps in mind for pursuing the issues regarding the computers and access to Launch.

To some extent on the defense side you have a moving target because it's an evolving set of facts coming from Stroz. So I'd like to have a schedule in which the first step is the plaintiff presents whatever it's going to present from Stroz, but to get to that, we need to just resolve access to Launch.

MR. NELKIN: And to the computers.

THE COURT: Yes, yes.

I'm open to suggestions how we proceed from here.

MR. NELKIN: I mean, your Honor, it's my understanding that quite a bit depends on, one, access to Launch, but it also depends on the place where Launch is being accessed, meaning, if they are just accessing it through a remote thing, that's not going to be able to determine anything.

PROCEEDINGS

1 THE COURT: You need the server.

2 MR. NELKIN: We need the server.

The other thing is right now the way that it's set up is not the way it used to be set up, meaning, the only way for -- well, I think we covered this about to copy documents or save a document.

THE COURT: Yeah. I don't know that there's going to be a solution to that. You know, part of I think what we need to plan for is to try and resolve these issues quickly, but also figure out a point at which we say it ain't getting resolved. And what we have to do is figure out the implications of the fact that the parties are not going to be able to reestablish in any meaningful way access to the Launch system and the records kept as they were originally kept.

I don't know if we're going to get to that point, but we need to recognize when we're there so we can take whatever action is appropriate thereafter. I don't think we should just indefinitely pursue more and different ways of trying to get access.

MR. NELKIN: I agree completely, your Honor. I also believe that there's a very significant issue with the same with regard to computers. I mean, computers clearly weren't preserved. There's some that we don't even know where they are. And so I think it's not just Launch that we may not be able to get back, I think it's the computers.

As to that, I want to be careful about 1 THE COURT: 2 how I phrase things because I don't know if what Stroz has 3 suggested is correct, if there are, in fact, computers that 4 haven't been disclosed and turned over, or if there's some 5 explanation. We're going to have to resolve that. 6 The short-term goal for me is to -- for all of us is 7 to get to a point where we recognize that we have the 8 information we're going to have and we're not continuing to 9 try and gather information on which decisions will be made. 10 So let's focus on that for the moment. Any suggestions about getting to that point? 11 12 Well, my other concern is, and I just MR. NELKIN: 13 don't know how to do this, is that I'm concerned that the 14 information that is on Launch may not be the same today that 15 it will be tomorrow. 16 THE COURT: Yes, I get it. 17 MR. NELKIN: So I don't even know how reliable any 18 new --19 THE COURT: Look, I understand. You're going to be 20 able to litigate that. Right now we're in an 21 information-gathering mode and we can't do that indefinitely. 22 At some point we have to say even if conceivably there is some 23 other step that could be taken to try and get more 24 information, the litigation has to move forward so we're going

to say this is the record on which decisions will be made

PROCEEDINGS

about such remedies as are appropriate. I'm trying to figure out how we get there, what steps, if any, any of you think need to be undertaken before we can say, okay, we've got the full record.

MR. SCHAFHAUSER: Your Honor, and on that point and to Mr. Nelkin's point just now about information on Launch that may or may not be available today or tomorrow. Again, we've all been before you so I don't know what is happening on the ground right now with Launch subsequent to the call this morning that I had with Yossi Rogosnitzky.

At some point, fingers crossed, prayers raised to heaven, I'm hopeful that we both, meaning plaintiff and defendants, will have access to two versions of Launch. I'm hopeful that that's today based on what I said earlier. If and when that occurs, I would assume that Stroz, who is a very fine firm that I think we all have heard about in other contexts, that I would assume that Stroz has the ability to — and this is where I trip myself up — either download or image or store or maintain or freeze or capture a picture of what is on Launch at that moment, both versions.

 $$\operatorname{MR.}$ NELKIN: Stroz has told me that they cannot do that.

THE COURT: Look, again, I may be showing my ignorance, but my understanding is that they can get an image of something, but I don't know that even Stroz, as competent

as they are, can make data transferable in a certain form if it doesn't exist in that transferable form in the original.

MR. SCHAFHAUSER: Okay.

THE COURT: I don't know. But here's what I'm going to suggest -- I'm sorry, you had wanted to speak and then I'll say what I was going to say.

MS. NELKIN: Well, I was just going to say that one thing that needs to be done in my opinion right away is that the defendants need to ascertain where these new computers are. And another thing that I think needs to be addressed, and I don't know what would be appropriate with regard to this, but the plaintiff has been put to great expense imaging computers that apparently were not the right computers.

So to the extent that we're now going to have to image other things, I think that the defendant should have to participate in the cost.

THE COURT: Look, issues of cost are going to be taken up later partly because, you know, you say it's the wrong computers. I don't know and I don't think I will know until we sort it out what information is and isn't available. If you've been given the wrong computers in bad faith, as result of an innocent mistake, or you've been given the only computers there are, I just can't make that decision at this point without the information we're trying to gather. You're not waiving any right to seek reimbursement, but I just don't

think I can address it now.

Here's what I'm going to suggest. Please weigh in on it if you disagree. I think the incentive is very much on the defendants and your remarks earlier, Mr. Schafhauser, are in accord with this. Defendants have every incentive in the world to show that they're cooperating in this process by finding a way to track down the server on which Launch exists and in the state it resides, to provide full access to Launch and to provide any explanation that's available and any information that's available with respect to these other computers that Stroz has identified.

So I'm going to put a deadline. By next Friday I want plaintiff and Stroz to have that information to the extent you can get it. Later it's going to be too late absent some extraordinary showing. A week after that, Stroz gives me -- again, I'm more than happy to talk about particular deadlines, but my proposal is a week for the defendants to get me and get the plaintiff what they can on those issues. And a week after that, Stroz digests the information and prepares its report to say here's what we think is going on.

MR. NELKIN: We don't have a problem with the timeline except for the fact that I don't know what Stroz can --

THE COURT: Yeah, that's what I'm saying. I'm open to changing the particular days because I don't know what they

1 can do either.

2 MR. NELKIN: I think it also depends on what they
3 are given access to.

THE COURT: Yes, I understand. Look, any deadline that we set is obviously subject to somebody saying it's unrealistic and, you know, reset.

Step one, defendants provide the information that I've described. Step two, Stroz provides a report and the plaintiffs, based on that report, say here's the relief that we seek. Step three, defendants say we disagree and here's why, here's what we propose. All right.

MR. SCHAFHAUSER: I agree with that. The only thing I would respectfully add is that to respond whenever it is to Stroz's report, we'll need access to the same imaged information as Stroz has.

THE COURT: I don't know that there would be any reason to disagree. Do you?

MR. NELKIN: No. I'm not sure what he's referring to.

THE COURT: Look, you're getting ideally access to

Launch, the server on which its data is resident and any other

computers that are turned up by the information that you have

already brought forward, if there are. I think what

Mr. Schafhauser is saying you don't get exclusive access to

any of that; they get it, too.

1	MR. NELKIN: We already arranged with Stroz to			
2	prepare a hard drive with all the images and to give to them.			
3	THE COURT: With respect to a computer, obviously			
4	not obviously, but my understanding is when Stroz does work or			
5	any other computer forensic expert, they will image it and			
6	work with the image. I think we're all on the same page that			
7	whether it's the image or the original computer, I guess			
8	preferably the image, you all have access to the same corpus			
9	of information.			
10	MR. SCHAFHAUSER: Yes, Your Honor.			
11	MR. NELKIN: Yes, we're basically giving them the			
12	same image that we got and by return of the computers.			
13	THE COURT: Yes.			
14	MR. SCHAFHAUSER: Okay. Thank you, Your Honor.			
15	THE COURT: Let's talk about the timing.			
16	MR. SCHAFHAUSER: Yes, Your Honor.			
17	THE COURT: I was going to say a week for each of			
18	these steps. I'm more than happy to have you weigh in as you			
19	are going along and say it's proven to be unrealistic, but as			
20	an initial schedule, does anybody see a problem with that?			
21	MR. SCHAFHAUSER: I'm just turning on my cell phone			
22	to look at my calendar			
23	THE COURT: Look at your schedules.			
24	MR. SCHAFHAUSER: your Honor.			
25	MR. NELKIN: Your Honor.			

1 THE COURT: Yes.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. NELKIN: Just one question as far as what you are anticipating once the reports are prepared, the next step will be with the Court. The only reason I ask is that my client has long-scheduled plans from --

THE COURT: I'm not anticipating, in the first instance, reconvening an evidentiary hearing. We all need to get our hands around what information is available. Once you have that, Stroz is going to give you a report and I am anticipating that you folks will send me the report, along with a letter that says, based on this, essentially, you know, here's what we think the facts are that you should find and here's the relief we think we're entitled to because of it. Ι don't want a long brief. This is either they have hid the ball and here's what's the appropriate response or it's not, They'll get a chance to write back and say here's why it doesn't happen. And if anybody says that we can't figure out what's appropriate without having somebody take the stand, we will talk about that, we'll make a schedule for that, but I'm not scheduling further testimony at this point.

MR. NELKIN: And the issue is limited to the computers and the Launch system as opposed to some other aspects we've been hearing about such as books and records compliance and things of that sort.

THE COURT: That's the issue I'm trying to deal with

- 1505 PROCEEDINGS 1 now. 2 MR. NELKIN: Okay. I just want to make sure I 3 know --4 Yes, I think the books and records part THE COURT: 5 of it can be done on a separate track and doesn't require as 6 much lead time. 7 MR. NELKIN: Thank you, Your Honor. 8 MR. SCHAFHAUSER: I've canvassed, and I hate to be 9 the spokesman all the time, but I've canvassed everyone and I 10 think a week, a week, a week I think it works for us. 11 THE COURT: All right. 12 So August 12th is the deadline for defendants 13 providing whatever information or access they are going to 14 provide on this matter regarding Launch and the computers. 15 After that it will be outside the record absent some 16 extraordinary showing. 17 MR. SCHAFHAUSER: Could I have is at least until the 18 following Monday, August 15th? 19 THE COURT: Any objection? 20 MR. NELKIN: No, Your Honor. 21 August 15th. Let me make my notes here. THE COURT:
- MR. NELKIN: Your Honor, are there any provisions in
- case the Launch system goes down after it's restored?
- 24 THE COURT: Not, I can't --
- MR. NELKIN: Okay.

THE COURT: Right. But if -- I think that's part of the record, right? If by August 15th they haven't provided access to Launch that is up and stays up, I'm going to draw certain inferences.

MR. NELKIN: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. So August 15th for the defendants to provide information and access. And I should say in that regard in terms of providing access to Launch, that's the deadline for essentially completing the record on which further submissions are going to be predicated. It does not serve as an extension of the deadline that has been in existence since last December for the defendants to provide access to Launch, that remains in effect, and to the extent that any remedy is appropriate for failing to do it by then, I'm not taking away anybody's right to seek such a remedy.

MR. NELKIN: Your Honor, can we also require -- I think it's clear but I just want to make sure, we've never, and I don't believe anyone here has represented they've ever had full access to Launch, we've always had a portion of it. There's an administration level that's above --

THE COURT: I'm talking about full access to all data on Launch and the ability to engage in all transactions on Launch. Just so it's clear, because the lines have been blurred a couple of times during the hearing, there are two distinct issues with respect to access to Launch. One is, to

- the limited extent clearly, that access to Launch is needed for the operation of Two Rivers. That's Mr. Papa's concern.
- A greater concern is to allow the parties to litigate the facts in dispute in this case.

MR. SCHAFHAUSER: Your Honor, as to that, when Mr. Nelkin says full access, what we've provided there are the passwords for the people that I control with the fullest possible access and, you know, I think that's what he was using. What I'm undertaking to do is to get both versions of the Launch to that level of access.

THE COURT: Okay, but Launch quite obviously has different levels of access. Whatever the highest level of access, the one that has no restrictions upon it is what is to be provided. I'm not saying you disagree --

MR. SCHAFHAUSER: No disagreeing. All I'm saying is the only thing that Mr. Nelkin keeps saying is the administrator --

THE COURT: It's a label.

MR. SCHAFHAUSER: The one thing I am not is in control of Yossi Rogosnitzky. I am certainly a represent -- counsel, and to the extent that Mr. Friedman has access to Launch, they're going to get the identical access that Mr. Friedman has and to extent Ms. Rivera --

THE COURT: Look, one of the factual issues raised in this hearing is whose interests, if anyone besides his own,

- 1 Mr. Rogosnitzky is serving.
- 2 MR. SCHAFHAUSER: Understood. I'm just raising that
- 3 as an issue.
- 4 THE COURT: Yes. All right. So August 15th, using
- 5 | a shorthand, close the record on the information and access
- 6 that's being provided. August 22nd for Stroz to provide a
- 7 report and the plaintiffs to make their submissions seeking
- 8 whatever relief they think is appropriate based on the facts
- 9 that have been disclosed, and August 29th for the defendants
- 10 to respond.
- 11 MR. NELKIN: Your Honor, could you make clear in the
- 12 order that extends to the server and --
- 13 THE COURT: Yes.
- MR. NELKIN: Thank you.
- MR. SCHAFHAUSER: I cautioned. I apologize.
- 16 THE COURT: We're never going to leave here.
- 17 MR. SCHAFHAUSER: I apologize. Go ahead.
- 18 THE COURT: Let's find a date to get back together
- 19 after I've had time to digest. I'm going to suggest -- let me
- 20 | see my schedule -- September 9th at 11:00 a.m.
- 21 MR. GRANTZ: What was the date, Judge?
- 22 THE COURT: September 9th at 11.
- 23 | MR. GRANTZ: Judge, I'm on trial in Suffolk County
- 24 | starting on September 7th, I don't think it will finish by
- 25 | September 9th. The following week would be better for me. I

PROCEEDINGS 1 apologize for the inconvenience. 2 September 12th at 2. THE COURT: 3 At two, Your Honor? MR. FINK: 4 THE COURT: Yes. Again, I'm not anticipating that 5 being an evidentiary hearing. If there is a need for such a 6 hearing, we will figure out amongst ourselves whether to make 7 it that afternoon or some other time. 8 MR. GRANTZ: Judge --9 MR. SCHAFHAUSER: Just a couple of points of 10 clarification, Your Honor. The images that are available and 11 existing with Stroz now, could we also have those by the same 12 August 15th exchange date? 13 I believe if you just provide me with MR. NELKIN: 14 an address for Stroz, I'll send it out tomorrow --15 MR. SCHAFHAUSER: Very well. 16 MR. NELKIN: -- or Monday. 17 MR. SCHAFHAUSER: Thank you, I appreciate it. 18 The second point is with respect to the comment 19 about the server, again the Court may end up making a 20 determination hearing testimony, but I am just telling, Your 21 Honor, that I cannot at this moment commit to producing a 22 server that is not within, what I understand to be, in my 23 client's custody, possession and control. 24 THE COURT: You guys are going to do what you can

25

and will do.

THE COURT: We need to take a short break so you can

consult about the counsel issue, yes?

23

24

25

MR. SCHAFHAUSER: Yes. And, frankly, what I was

- probably going to end up doing is having a meet and confer 1 2 with plaintiff. I don't know -- in other words, I don't know 3 whether the issue can be resolved in 15 minutes or not, but 4 I'm happy to meet and confer with plaintiff's counsel. 5 THE COURT: Let's leave this because I don't want us 6 all sitting around waiting for something we're rushing the 7 conversation, but give me a letter at the end of day not 8 arquing, please. 9 MR. SCHAFHAUSER: Yes. I understand. 10 THE COURT: Just there's an agreement on this or 11 there is not. 12 MR. SCHAFHAUSER: Yes, Your Honor. 13 THE COURT: Okay. There was one other issue though 14 you were going to drawn counsel -- I didn't take a note. 15 there a second issue you were going to consult with Mr. Friedman about, or was it all about the counsel issue? 16 17 MR. SCHAFHAUSER: I'll check my notes as well, Your 18 There's been so many issues raised. 19 THE COURT: Yes. Anybody recall? 20 MR. SCHAFHAUSER: I honestly don't remember. 21 there is I'll write a letter to the Court, with the Court's
- THE COURT: You know what, I think it was the 23 24 related issue about information.
- 25 MR. SCHAFHAUSER: Yes.

22

permission.

1512

PROCEEDINGS

	PROCEEDINGS		
1	THE COURT: The information sharing.		
2	MR. SCHAFHAUSER: Yes.		
3	THE COURT: Again, all of that springs not		
4	springs, but a lot of it can more readily be resolved once Two		
5	Rivers, as an entity, has a seat at the table and can talk to		
6	both sides about ways to go forward. But I think it has to be		
7	represented just to have that conversation.		
8	MR. SCHAFHAUSER: Yes, Your Honor.		
9	THE COURT: All right. Anything else before we		
10	break?		
11	MR. SCHAFHAUSER: No, Your Honor, thank you.		
12	THE COURT: It's been a pleasure spending the week		
13	with all of you.		
14	MR. SCHAFHAUSER: Thank you, Your Honor.		
15	MR. FINK: Have a nice weekend, Your Honor.		
16	THE COURT: I'm not going to suggest we do it again		
17	soon. Folks, let me ask you, you have lots of boxes here, it		
18	doesn't have to be out today, but take them home including the		
19	boxes you've left for me unless you think I need to keep them		
20	here.		
21	MR. SCHAFHAUSER: I will probably have a messenger		
22	take home this later today, Your Honor.		
23	MR. NELKIN: Is there a mechanism they told us		
24	that there might be for some way for us to get closer to		
0.5			

the courthouse to pick up the boxes.

25

	2	1455/13 1458/10 1467/24 1477/16
Case 1:15-cv-06861-CBA-JO Do MR. BERGSON: [1] 1457/19	Cument 331 Filed 11/02/16 Pa 30 [1] 1440/17	1455/13 1458/10 1467/24 1477/16 96479/12 1479/24 1479/25 #492/2681
MR. FELDMAN: [2] 1494/5 1494/13		1492/21 1493/1 1493/2 1493/18
MR. FINK: [2] 1509/2 1512/14	4	1494/21 1494/23 1500/1 1509/14 addressed [5] 1451/20 1455/18 1456/24
MR. FINKEL: [4] 1436/20 1437/2	400 [1] 1461/4	1472/10 1499/10
1437/19 1454/13 MR. FRIEDMAN: [1] 1437/25	5	adjourned [1] 1513/11
MR. GRANTZ: [6] 1508/20 1508/22	5:30 [1] 1431/5	adjourning [1] 1513/8
1509/7 1510/6 1510/12 1510/17	5th [1] 1445/24	adjusted [1] 1445/5
MR. HELLER: [13] 1467/23 1467/25	6	administration [1] 1506/20 administrator [4] 1449/11 1449/19
1484/3 1484/25 1485/2 1485/6 1485/8	6.1.2 [1] 1465/22	1449/19 1507/17
1485/11 1485/17 1486/2 1486/4 1486/17 1486/20	6.12 [3] 1464/10 1465/2 1465/6	adopt [1] 1454/21
MR. NELKIN: [65]	60 [1] 1476/3	advance [1] 1472/10
MR. ROSENBLATT: [9] 1470/17	6861 [1] 1426/3	advancing [1] 1446/7 adversaries [1] 1444/4
1470/22 1472/5 1472/10 1482/16	6:00 [2] 1431/4 1431/5	adverse [2] 1476/5 1477/3
1482/24 1483/3 1483/21 1484/1 MR. SCHAFHAUSER: [125]	6:30 [1] 1431/4 6th [1] 1445/24	advise [1] 1428/14
MR. SCHREIBER: [1] 1513/3		advised [5] 1429/13 1430/3 1431/17
MS. NELKIN: [21] 1439/10 1439/17	7	1431/19 1431/21
1440/9 1440/16 1440/25 1445/19	718-613-2330 [1] 1426/21	affect [2] 1435/1 1452/6 afternoon [1] 1509/7
1449/5 1451/16 1456/4 1457/24	718-804-2712 [1] 1426/21 7:00 [1] 1440/6	agenda [2] 1440/14 1493/10
1459/20 1461/24 1462/17 1464/7 1468/9 1468/17 1468/24 1469/7 1487/4	7:00 1	ago [10] 1429/2 1430/1 1432/24 1434/4
1488/8 1499/6		1450/11 1452/6 1452/17 1453/12
MS. PASTRIKOS: [1] 1430/18	8	1473/18 1489/20
THE COURT: [217]	8:30 that [1] 1434/18	agree [6] 1438/19 1458/7 1471/25 1479/5 1496/20 1501/12
THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: [1]	9	agreed [5] 1434/18 1474/11 1478/3
	9:30 [1] 1426/6	1489/9 1494/14
\$	9th [4] 1457/6 1508/20 1508/22 1508/25	agreeing [1] 1472/24 agreement [39] 1438/11 1438/13 1455/8
\$500,000 [1] 1461/5	A	1455/14 1460/5 1460/17 1461/6
-	a.m [2] 1426/6 1508/20	1461/20 1462/8 1462/23 1463/3 1467/5
x [2] 1426/2	abeyance [1] 1477/22	1467/6 1469/11 1469/15 1469/18
1426/9	ability [7] 1445/3 1445/5 1449/2 1460/1 1476/19 1498/17 1506/22	1469/22 1471/15 1471/19 1472/23 1473/1 1473/22 1474/21 1474/23
1	able [22] 1429/9 1430/18 1430/20	1474/24 1477/17 1477/23 1479/16
10 [1] 1464/11	1430/21 1431/9 1436/10 1440/11	1480/23 1481/3 1481/5 1481/15
10:45a.m [1] 1470/16	1441/2 1444/1 1444/10 1446/10 1447/2	1481/22 1482/12 1482/21 1484/7
11 [1] 1508/22	1447/3 1448/11 1458/7 1470/5 1477/6 1486/23 1495/24 1496/13 1496/25	1489/15 1489/20 1511/10 agrees [1] 1460/3
11:00 a.m [1] 1508/20 12 [1] 1513/11	1496/23 1495/24 1496/13 1496/25	ahead [3] 1454/12 1478/7 1508/17
12[1] 1513/11 12th [2] 1505/12 1509/2	absence [2] 1474/23 1489/14	aided [1] 1426/24
14th [1] 1439/21	absent [3] 1468/7 1500/14 1505/15	ain't [1] 1496/10
15 [1] 1511/3	absolutely [1] 1439/20	Akiva [1] 1447/21
15-CV-6861 [1] 1426/3	access [68] accessed [3] 1445/25 1445/25 1495/23	al [1] 1426/7 alert [1] 1448/22
15th [7] 1439/22 1505/18 1505/21 1506/2 1506/6 1508/4 1509/12	accessing [1] 1495/23	allegations [1] 1454/7
1506/2 1506/6 1508/4 1509/12 165 [1] 1427/4	accomplish [2] 1428/25 1446/10	allow [4] 1443/19 1444/14 1457/18
1st [1] 1442/5	accord [1] 1500/5	1507/3
2	account [3] 1436/18 1494/20 1494/23	allowed [2] 1428/24 1465/13 allowing [1] 1494/7
2012 [1] 1484/8	accountant [1] 1490/13 accounts [2] 1441/7 1494/18	alluded [1] 1454/7
2012 [1] 1484/8 2016 [5] 1426/6 1431/22 1431/24	act [1] 1468/6	alone [1] 1483/7
1432/11 1433/12	acting [5] 1461/12 1468/20 1475/6	alter [1] 1449/4
22 [1] 1510/9	1484/6 1491/24	altered [1] 1445/9
22nd [1] 1508/6	action [7] 1463/5 1463/20 1466/24	amendment [5] 1462/7 1465/20 1465/22 1465/24 1465/25
2330 [1] 1426/21 24 [1] 1427/2	1468/3 1481/12 1484/15 1496/17 actions [4] 1460/2 1460/7 1477/5	Amon [8] 1457/6 1457/19 1460/24
24 1 1427/2 25th	1491/21	1472/24 1479/2 1479/5 1487/18
26 [11] 1427/14 1462/25 1479/21	active [1] 1440/16	1492/10
1479/22 1480/24 1484/6 1484/8 1484/9	actual [1] 1439/20	amount [1] 1469/22
1484/15 1485/9 1485/16	add [2] 1451/19 1501/13 addiction [1] 1464/11	analysis [2] 1440/19 1450/19 analyst [1] 1436/2
265 [1] 1428/6 2712 [1] 1426/21	adding [1] 1486/25	answer [4] 1436/15 1438/20 1493/5
2712 13 1420/21 29th 3 1429/1 1429/12 1508/9	addition [3] 1453/6 1457/25 1487/19	1510/15
2nd [2] 1433/12 1442/14	additional [2] 1454/22 1462/22	answering [1] 1491/13
	address [23] 1437/13 1437/14 1437/18 1439/12 1439/19 1443/14 1445/21	anti [1] 1473/15 anti-waiver [1] 1473/15
	1700/12 1700/13 1770/14 1770/21	

attempt [1] 488410 books [2] 1504/23 1505/4 #: 12782 CHEMPHO 3311451 ed 11/02/16 e 1:15-cv-06861-CBA-JO anticipate [2] 1471/6 1480/19 bottom [2] 1437/3 1476/18 attempting [1] 1484/16 anticipating [4] 1504/3 1504/6 1504/10 attempts [1] 1448/22 boxes [3] 1512/17 1512/19 1512/25 1509/4 attend [1] 1491/2 break [5] 1470/13 1493/9 1495/7 antivirus [5] 1442/6 1447/7 1447/17 attention [3] 1464/10 1478/3 1495/5 1510/23 1512/10 1447/20 1448/6 attributed [1] 1432/18 brief [3] 1475/19 1493/7 1504/14 Anyhow [1] 1431/6 August [11] 1426/6 1505/12 1505/18 briefly [4] 1428/8 1450/10 1479/12 anyway [1] 1469/11 1505/21 1506/2 1506/6 1508/4 1508/6 1479/17 apologize [4] 1487/6 1508/15 1508/17 bring [3] 1440/5 1441/2 1478/3 1508/9 1509/12 1510/9 1509/1 August 12th [1] 1505/12 bringing [1] 1484/15 apparent [1] 1459/2 August 15th [6] 1505/18 1505/21 1506/2 broader [1] 1449/19 appear [5] 1443/6 1444/10 1461/5 1506/6 1508/4 1509/12 broadly [1] 1455/1 1490/9 1490/9 broker [1] 1491/17 August 22 [1] 1510/9 appearance [1] 1451/5 August 22nd [1] 1508/6 Brooklyn [1] 1426/4 APPEARANCES [1] 1426/13 August 29th [1] 1508/9 brought [2] 1458/9 1501/23 application [5] 1463/22 1480/20 1482/1 authority [1] 1463/7 BRUCE [1] 1427/8 1492/7 1510/4 authorize [2] 1465/7 1488/19 budget [1] 1489/6 applications [1] 1452/21 authorized [1] 1466/9 business [19] 1459/6 1467/22 1468/23 apply [2] 1463/16 1466/22 available [28] 1431/14 1431/23 1432/1 1471/3 1471/18 1471/23 1474/9 appoint [7] 1474/5 1474/21 1474/22 1433/18 1434/1 1434/5 1434/6 1434/8 1474/11 1477/6 1479/24 1480/1 1480/2 1475/11 1477/10 1487/8 1487/9 1434/11 1434/12 1436/3 1436/25 1481/18 1486/6 1486/7 1486/12 appointing [2] 1487/20 1487/25 1436/25 1440/25 1443/13 1443/13 1486/13 1488/22 1488/22 appointment [3] 1472/19 1473/13 1445/16 1450/7 1450/7 1450/8 1480/22 businesses [1] 1486/10 1487/24 1481/23 1498/7 1499/20 1500/9 buy [1] 1478/11 appreciate [8] 1470/19 1477/18 1479/10 1500/10 1504/8 1509/10 buying [2] 1464/1 1465/10 1479/11 1486/25 1488/6 1490/16 Avenue [1] 1427/5 buys [1] 1489/1 1509/17 AVERY [1] 1427/6 appreciated [1] 1452/19 С avoid [3] 1467/12 1468/7 1495/5 appropriate [13] 1437/8 1450/25 aware [2] 1449/10 1471/9 calendar [1] 1503/22 1470/12 1476/22 1487/19 1489/17 camera [1] 1482/6 1496/17 1498/1 1499/11 1504/15 camps [1] 1463/3 1504/18 1506/14 1508/8 candid [1] 1475/5 bad [1] 1499/21 April [2] 1431/24 1433/19 cannot [6] 1434/15 1435/22 1435/24 ball [1] 1504/15 April 2016 [1] 1431/24 bank [3] 1441/7 1494/18 1494/19 1478/3 1498/21 1509/21 arbitrable [1] 1466/16 based [10] 1436/22 1437/18 1443/8 canvassed [2] 1505/8 1505/9 arbitration [2] 1484/16 1484/18 1444/9 1446/3 1446/12 1498/14 1501/9 capita [2] 1466/6 1466/21 area [7] 1434/21 1446/6 1469/13 capture [1] 1498/19 1504/11 1508/8 1471/19 1471/25 1475/8 1489/13 basis [1] 1481/11 careful [1] 1497/1 areas [3] 1459/25 1472/9 1483/16 bat [2] 1480/12 1480/13 carefully [2] 1472/15 1472/16 arguing [2] 1488/15 1511/8 be -- I [2] 1478/6 1482/5 CAROL [1] 1426/14 argument [3] 1450/1 1464/3 1480/11 be -- it's [1] 1483/16 case [10] 1439/17 1444/25 1470/21 arises [4] 1444/12 1478/25 1481/17 be -- look [1] 1469/10 1473/12 1475/25 1476/3 1491/2 1494/4 1492/20 became [1] 1459/2 1505/23 1507/4 arising [1] 1494/9 becomes [3] 1477/2 1480/9 1510/14 category [1] 1462/19 arose [1] 1488/15 beforehand [1] 1445/9 CATHERINE [2] 1426/18 1430/17 arranged [1] 1503/1 began [2] 1442/25 1484/12 caused [2] 1463/5 1473/12 articulate [1] 1445/13 behalf [12] 1429/19 1434/9 1439/6 cautioned [1] 1508/15 articulated [2] 1482/8 1488/6 1460/2 1460/20 1461/12 1461/19 caveat [3] 1454/24 1472/21 1478/21 ascertain [1] 1499/9 1468/20 1469/6 1470/2 1470/18 1487/7 caveats [1] 1472/20 ascribe [1] 1432/25 belabor [1] 1430/4 CBA [1] 1426/3 aspect [1] 1449/9 belated [1] 1493/24 cell [1] 1503/21 aspects [1] 1504/23 certain [18] 1455/9 1455/22 1455/23 believe -- we [1] 1493/18 assert [1] 1472/16 belong [1] 1454/10 1458/2 1460/2 1460/5 1460/7 1460/10 asserted [3] 1431/23 1432/15 1438/6 bench [1] 1450/4 1462/13 1464/9 1476/16 1477/19 asserting [3] 1435/9 1476/13 1476/14 benefit [2] 1451/9 1491/6 1477/24 1478/1 1492/24 1493/17 assertion [1] 1452/19 1499/1 1506/4 BERGSON [1] 1427/10 assertions [2] 1449/23 1450/18 best [5] 1426/16 1451/5 1451/15 certainly [7] 1434/10 1442/1 1451/24 asserts [3] 1433/5 1433/19 1433/24 1456/11 1478/5 1478/9 1507/20 1451/23 1474/18 assign [1] 1485/25 beth [3] 1442/3 1442/4 1442/7 chair [1] 1491/12 Associated [1] 1427/3 Beverages [1] 1427/13 challenge [2] 1474/16 1492/6 Associates [1] 1427/5 chance [5] 1428/7 1428/8 1444/4 beyond [1] 1436/18 assume [10] 1432/25 1435/2 1438/9 1461/13 1504/16 bill [1] 1489/2 1476/24 1476/25 1487/4 1489/7 Birnbaum [1] 1427/13 change [3] 1481/4 1481/5 1502/4 1490/11 1498/15 1498/17 bit [3] 1451/18 1495/21 1510/11 changed [2] 1447/1 1494/4 assumed [1] 1488/22 block [2] 1463/7 1467/4 changes [1] 1479/8 assumes [1] 1440/1 blocked [1] 1448/19 changing [3] 1435/1 1446/18 1500/25 assuming [1] 1445/12 blunt [1] 1434/10 characterize [2] 1429/17 1444/11 assumptions [1] 1461/9 blurred [1] 1506/24 check [1] 1511/17 astounded [1] 1439/13 bone [1] 1483/25 checked [1] 1440/17

cse 1:15-cv-06861-CBA-JO computer [11] 1426/24 1440/1 1440/20 1444/6 442/6 1448/25 1459/1 1455/2 checks [1] 1441/8 choose [1] 1475/2 circumstances [2] 1451/7 1492/25 cite [1] 1465/14 cited [1] 1465/17 civil [2] 1426/10 1439/17 claim [1] 1447/7 claimed [1] 1484/20 claims [1] 1441/9 clarification [3] 1472/3 1488/12 1509/10 clarifying [2] 1479/1 1490/2 clarity [1] 1469/18 clear [15] 1432/9 1454/24 1457/1 1457/21 1458/25 1460/12 1470/23 1472/7 1473/7 1478/17 1479/7 1481/7 1506/17 1506/23 1508/11 clearing [1] 1446/7 clearly [8] 1471/14 1471/17 1471/18 1472/16 1483/5 1491/6 1496/22 1507/1 clerk [1] 1513/3 client [28] 1429/4 1429/8 1429/13 1429/16 1429/19 1429/22 1431/10 1434/9 1450/16 1454/18 1464/7 1466/15 1470/3 1472/15 1472/18 1472/24 1476/14 1478/10 1484/12 1485/6 1485/7 1485/23 1486/14 1487/9 1488/11 1492/13 1495/8 1504/5 client's [5] 1481/1 1487/7 1490/16 1490/18 1509/23 clients [3] 1456/6 1471/23 1484/9 climb [1] 1491/20 close [2] 1451/19 1508/5 closer [1] 1512/24 Co [1] 1426/18 coffee [6] 1426/16 1427/15 1427/17 1462/25 1468/15 1484/10 coincidence [1] 1440/11 comfortable [1] 1474/12 coming [3] 1452/8 1459/15 1495/12 comment [3] 1473/15 1479/17 1509/18 commentary [2] 1476/19 1476/20 comments [2] 1479/13 1488/7 commit [1] 1509/21 commitment [1] 1502/3 communicate [1] 1429/10 communicated [2] 1430/12 1431/5 communicating [1] 1463/4 communications [6] 1459/10 1459/12 1476/2 1476/8 1476/24 1477/1 companies [2] 1484/8 1485/22 company [45] company's [1] 1474/16 compare [2] 1436/2 1444/24 compete [1] 1484/12 competence [1] 1475/7 competent [1] 1498/25 competing [12] 1462/24 1467/22 1479/24 1480/1 1480/2 1483/6 1486/2 1486/6 1486/7 1486/8 1486/10 1486/13 competition [3] 1484/9 1485/13 1485/22 competitive [3] 1463/20 1467/21 1468/3 competitor [4] 1463/7 1468/5 1483/10 1484/6 complained [1] 1431/13 completely [1] 1496/20 completing [1] 1506/9 compliance [3] 1445/15 1454/3 1504/24 complicated [2] 1446/6 1493/21

1503/3 1503/5 1503/7 computer-aided [1] 1426/24 computers [33] 1435/6 1439/22 1443/5 1443/6 1443/7 1445/23 1445/24 1451/23 1454/10 1454/15 1454/19 1457/15 1458/4 1458/11 1458/19 1495/10 1495/17 1496/22 1496/22 1496/25 1497/3 1499/9 1499/13 1499/13 1499/19 1499/21 1499/23 1500/11 1501/22 1502/4 1503/12 1504/22 1505/14 conceivably [1] 1497/22 concept [1] 1486/19 concern [12] 1451/1 1458/5 1468/11 1470/20 1471/1 1471/10 1471/11 1483/19 1486/15 1497/12 1507/2 1507/3 concerned [4] 1451/22 1468/25 1472/8 1497/13 concerns [1] 1450/24 concludes [1] 1489/15 conclusion [2] 1444/3 1488/10 conduct [4] 1438/19 1438/25 1450/19 1461/18 confer [5] 1473/18 1473/19 1488/5 1511/1 1511/4 conference [2] 1430/15 1448/2 confidence [2] 1441/22 1446/14 confirm [2] 1429/13 1431/9 confirmation [1] 1429/2 conflict [1] 1486/12 confusion [2] 1434/22 1446/8 congruent [1] 1456/9 conjunction [1] 1485/16 connectivity [1] 1430/25 consent [49] consenting [1] 1473/13 considering [1] 1483/10 consistent [2] 1467/5 1468/6 consult [6] 1467/19 1492/13 1492/14 1495/7 1510/24 1511/15 consulted [2] 1472/14 1510/13 consuming [1] 1450/22 contacted [1] 1431/10 contempt [1] 1490/8 contentious [2] 1470/24 1492/17 contest [1] 1479/23 context [7] 1430/1 1484/4 1484/13 1485/12 1486/22 1486/22 1486/25 contexts [1] 1498/17 continue [2] 1441/11 1458/19 Continued [3] 1427/1 1464/16 1502/7 continuing [6] 1451/3 1451/9 1451/16 1452/14 1459/7 1497/8 contract [2] 1465/13 1466/4 contract -- it's [1] 1465/13 contractors [1] 1465/17 control [6] 1436/8 1485/4 1485/5 1507/7 1507/20 1509/23 controversial [1] 1459/24 conversation [7] 1429/18 1431/16 1431/17 1433/14 1439/1 1511/7 1512/7 conversations [2] 1483/13 1513/9 cooperate [1] 1493/20 cooperating [1] 1500/6 cooperativeness [1] 1491/15 copy [2] 1491/1 1496/5 core [1] 1454/23

Corp [5] 1426/19 1427/2 1427/4 1427/4 g_{427/4} of 100 Page D #: 12783 corporate [2] 1492/20 1493/2 corpus [1] 1503/8 correct [12] 1430/16 1432/19 1435/2 1435/8 1440/16 1443/6 1458/7 1465/8 1477/14 1484/25 1494/17 1497/3 cost [2] 1499/16 1499/17 counsel [73] counsels [1] 1483/13 count [1] 1458/1 counterproductive [1] 1451/21 County [1] 1508/23 couple [10] 1444/8 1450/11 1460/12 1461/5 1462/2 1473/18 1477/16 1482/17 1506/24 1509/9 course [8] 1429/8 1431/15 1431/17 1444/18 1461/17 1471/11 1473/4 1476/16 Court's [3] 1430/25 1479/25 1511/21 courthouse [4] 1426/4 1428/19 1440/7 1512/25 courtroom [1] 1453/17 covered [2] 1469/10 1496/5 CPA [1] 1427/9 crafted [1] 1445/8 crashed [2] 1447/3 1448/3 Crazy [1] 1427/14 created [1] 1445/8 credibility [1] 1433/1 credible [1] 1441/15 cross [1] 1453/6 cross-examining [1] 1453/6 crossed [1] 1498/11 CSOs [1] 1513/1 CSR [1] 1426/20 Cups [2] 1427/14 1484/10 custody [4] 1436/8 1437/6 1438/6 1509/23 cut [1] 1446/11 CV [1] 1426/3 D

damming [1] 1444/22 DANELCZYK [1] 1426/20 data [17] 1434/14 1435/2 1435/6 1435/21 1437/4 1437/22 1439/25 1445/4 1445/9 1446/14 1447/4 1449/4 1450/6 1458/21 1499/1 1501/21 1506/22 date [5] 1433/20 1445/24 1508/18 1508/21 1509/12 dates [1] 1443/9 DAVID [2] 1426/17 1427/2 day -- he [1] 1472/22 day-to-day [6] 1459/13 1465/7 1469/11 1469/14 1471/15 1474/17 deadline [5] 1500/12 1501/4 1505/12 1506/9 1506/11 deadlines [1] 1500/17 deal [3] 1469/4 1494/25 1504/25 dealing [3] 1458/5 1488/11 1492/17 dealt [1] 1475/21 debating [1] 1442/17 December [4] 1439/21 1439/22 1450/23 1506/12 December 14th [1] 1439/21 December 15th [1] 1439/22 decide [3] 1438/3 1478/23 1482/23 decided [2] 1479/9 1487/20

effort [2] 1445(11-1445(15) #: 12784 discharge [1] 1490/6 discharmer [1] 1453/46 11/02/16 Ţ e 1:15-cv-06861-CBA-JO deciding [1] 1467/13 disclose [3] 1435/17 1436/4 1438/24 either [11] 1429/8 1435/19 1452/16 decision [8] 1469/3 1470/24 1474/16 disclosed [3] 1476/17 1497/4 1508/9 1475/3 1475/18 1479/4 1489/10 1492/1 1482/23 1483/1 1483/2 1492/5 1499/23 disclosing [1] 1468/4 1498/18 1501/1 1504/14 decision and [1] 1483/2 disclosure [4] 1431/16 1431/20 1435/14 electronic [2] 1456/19 1456/21 decisions [8] 1463/4 1466/3 1469/14 1483/11 elicited [2] 1453/22 1460/14 1471/3 1471/7 1471/18 1497/9 1497/25 disconnect [1] 1459/17 Email [1] 1426/22 declining [2] 1477/13 1477/14 discover [1] 1444/14 EMIL [2] 1426/7 1426/16 deem [1] 1480/17 discovered [1] 1429/12 employment [1] 1466/4 defend [2] 1438/19 1474/6 endeavor [2] 1471/4 1472/6 discovery [3] 1456/19 1456/21 1456/23 defendant [1] 1499/15 discussed [1] 1435/4 engage [1] 1506/22 defendant's [5] 1450/15 1452/3 1453/10 discussion [1] 1428/15 engagement [1] 1462/5 1460/14 1464/14 discussions [1] 1456/15 entered [6] 1457/6 1457/12 1460/7 defendants [28] 1426/8 1426/15 1426/17 dispositive [1] 1478/23 1480/22 1480/25 1481/5 1427/2 1427/6 1427/8 1427/10 1427/12 dispute [20] 1432/7 1432/18 1432/20 entering [1] 1479/1 1427/16 1430/10 1441/9 1447/1 1453/1 1432/22 1455/22 1455/24 1457/4 entirely [1] 1435/7 1459/16 1460/8 1460/16 1488/17 1459/6 1462/17 1466/13 1466/15 entities [1] 1479/20 1498/13 1499/9 1500/4 1500/5 1500/17 1467/20 1472/3 1472/9 1473/14 1478/1 entitled [5] 1455/9 1482/2 1482/11 1501/7 1501/10 1505/12 1506/7 1478/24 1483/16 1483/20 1507/4 1489/5 1504/13 1506/12 1508/9 disputed [1] 1455/20 disputes [5] 1457/10 1472/5 1474/12 entity [6] 1437/7 1439/8 1453/24 1475/6 defense [4] 1454/25 1456/2 1456/10 1475/24 1512/5 1495/11 1483/24 1484/1 entrusted [1] 1466/25 defer [2] 1474/3 1475/1 disqualified [1] 1465/14 enumerated [3] 1462/9 1462/14 1462/20 deferring [3] 1475/9 1475/9 1482/20 degree [2] 1455/12 1455/13 disqualify [1] 1492/6 ESI [2] 1456/21 1457/16 disseminate [1] 1491/1 ESQ [11] 1426/14 1426/14 1426/15 delayed [2] 1448/2 1448/2 disseminating [1] 1433/8 1426/17 1426/18 1427/2 1427/6 1427/8 delivered [3] 1491/23 1493/13 1493/15 dissolving [1] 1471/18 1427/10 1427/12 1427/16 delivery [2] 1427/2 1490/23 distinct [1] 1506/25 essence [1] 1456/20 demanded [3] 1429/15 1429/18 1434/17 distinction [1] 1492/3 essentially [6] 1473/5 1473/13 1474/17 demeanor [1] 1491/14 distributing [1] 1433/7 distribution [2] 1427/14 1486/7 distributors [1] 1484/10 1485/15 1504/11 1506/9 denied [4] 1446/18 1446/19 1461/21 et [1] 1426/7 1484/17 Europe [1] 1462/5 Department [1] 1493/25 DISTRICT [2] 1426/1 1426/1 evening [1] 1431/15 deposition [2] 1457/9 1458/3 dock [2] 1513/6 1513/7 event [1] 1452/10 deputy [1] 1513/4 docket [1] 1456/16 events [1] 1451/13 described [1] 1501/8 document [7] 1428/6 1450/17 1457/7 evidence [18] 1435/5 1435/6 1441/23 describes [1] 1465/9 1457/10 1457/18 1458/11 1496/6 1442/1 1442/24 1443/3 1444/22 despite [2] 1441/18 1490/3 documents [10] 1441/21 1456/22 1445/22 1448/9 1450/18 1452/14 detect [1] 1444/10 1452/24 1453/7 1453/9 1453/10 1454/2 1457/21 1458/2 1458/6 1459/3 1459/11 determination [4] 1455/15 1455/19 1459/14 1490/1 1496/5 1454/8 1455/4 1477/19 1509/20 dollar [1] 1469/22 evidentiary [4] 1426/10 1457/2 1504/7 determine [1] 1495/24 done [9] 1431/21 1433/10 1442/9 1509/5 determined [1] 1441/22 1452/11 1455/6 1461/19 1471/7 1499/8 evolving [1] 1495/12 develop [3] 1452/10 1453/8 1458/18 1505/5 ex [4] 1463/22 1468/6 1468/7 1482/6 developing [1] 1451/16 doors [1] 1468/22 exact [3] 1433/19 1445/24 1448/15 development [2] 1451/9 1452/14 doubt [3] 1441/18 1467/16 1491/16 exactly [2] 1443/25 1456/9 devices [1] 1457/21 down [12] 1432/11 1440/2 1440/3 examine [1] 1452/17 Devine [4] 1427/9 1427/9 1494/3 1441/14 1441/17 1443/11 1446/15 examined [1] 1437/6 1494/11 1471/12 1494/12 1495/3 1500/7 examining [1] 1453/6 Devine's [1] 1493/25 1505/23 example [7] 1445/23 1454/17 1463/8 didn't -- unfortunately [1] 1473/21 download [1] 1498/18 1464/1 1489/24 1490/23 1491/22 different [8] 1441/25 1443/24 1446/25 downstairs [1] 1513/2 exceedingly [1] 1431/8 1460/12 1480/15 1482/14 1496/18 draw [4] 1443/18 1464/10 1492/3 except [5] 1453/11 1466/6 1474/20 1507/12 1506/3 1491/12 1500/22 difficult [2] 1483/17 1485/17 drawing [2] 1440/9 1440/10 exchange [3] 1456/22 1457/18 1509/12 difficulties [1] 1492/18 drawn [2] 1448/22 1511/14 exchanged [1] 1473/19 digest [1] 1508/19 drive [1] 1503/2 exclusive [1] 1501/24 digests [1] 1500/19 driving [2] 1428/19 1431/11 Excuse [1] 1513/8 din [3] 1442/3 1442/4 1442/7 dues [1] 1458/2 exercise [2] 1481/14 1489/11 direct [2] 1459/10 1459/12 duplicate [1] 1441/7 exfoliation [1] 1444/11 directed [4] 1429/7 1457/19 1473/16 duty [1] 1475/23 exhibit [2] 1464/15 1491/2 1490/3 Exhibit 6 [1] 1464/15 directing [1] 1457/7 exist [2] 1454/16 1499/2 directly [2] 1431/9 1459/16 earliest [1] 1449/10 existence [1] 1506/12 disagree [6] 1459/19 1481/24 1500/3 early [2] 1472/5 1475/17 existing [2] 1433/18 1509/11 1501/10 1501/17 1507/14 EASTERN [1] 1426/1 exists [1] 1500/7 disagreeing [1] 1507/15 easy [1] 1436/6 expect [1] 1450/8 disagreement [1] 1459/20 effect [1] 1506/13 expectation [1] 1450/12 disagrees [1] 1459/10 efficient [1] 1479/4 expense [1] 1499/12

gentleman [1] 1434/9 Geoffrey [2] 1427/496497#112785 1454/13 CHINENT 4331₆ Filed 11/02/16 e 1:15-cv-06861-CRA-JO experience [3] 1471/20 1471/22 1471/23 first [14] 1446/19 1446/19 1447/19 given [9] 1429/15 1441/13 1446/23 expert [2] 1503/5 1510/12 1447/25 1469/16 1472/21 1473/2 1449/14 1475/7 1482/10 1499/21 explain [1] 1443/25 1499/22 1501/3 1477/16 1479/3 1482/18 1489/7 explained [2] 1435/7 1454/20 1490/25 1495/13 1504/6 gloss [1] 1491/5 explanation [2] 1497/5 1500/9 fit [1] 1474/5 gmail.com [1] 1426/22 explanations [1] 1441/14 five [2] 1448/12 1470/13 goal [2] 1452/23 1497/6 explicitly [1] 1471/18 five-minute [1] 1470/13 goals [1] 1467/12 extends [1] 1508/12 flagrant [1] 1484/7 going-forward [1] 1481/11 extension [1] 1506/11 flavors [11] 1427/14 1462/25 1479/21 Goldfarb [1] 1447/21 extensively [1] 1453/20 1479/22 1480/24 1484/6 1484/8 1484/9 gotta [3] 1485/21 1491/11 1491/13 extent [25] 1430/6 1442/20 1449/21 1484/15 1485/10 1485/16 GRANTZ [3] 1426/17 1427/2 1436/14 1452/4 1454/1 1467/3 1467/16 1468/2 flesh [1] 1483/25 gray [4] 1469/13 1471/19 1471/24 1469/12 1476/8 1477/4 1478/24 flip [1] 1461/3 1489/13 1480/21 1481/10 1482/22 1486/9 focus [3] 1442/18 1443/16 1497/10 great [2] 1472/1 1499/12 1494/2 1494/8 1495/11 1499/14 folks [3] 1491/18 1504/10 1512/17 greater [2] 1449/13 1507/3 1500/14 1506/13 1507/1 1507/21 following [4] 1442/2 1446/10 1505/18 Greenblatt [3] 1474/13 1491/24 1492/3 1507/23 grocers [1] 1468/15 1508/25 extraordinary [4] 1439/25 1441/12 foot [1] 1463/3 ground [1] 1498/9 1500/15 1505/16 for -- well [1] 1496/5 Group [1] 1426/18 extremely [1] 1444/2 forensic [5] 1436/2 1450/19 1503/5 guaranteed [1] 1494/12 Ezell [1] 1427/6 1510/9 1510/12 guess [4] 1440/22 1444/7 1493/24 forget [2] 1436/22 1444/8 1503/7 forgive [2] 1442/16 1458/17 Guy [1] 1513/5 face [2] 1428/20 1490/7 form [2] 1499/1 1499/2 guys [6] 1471/22 1486/9 1488/20 1489/3 facet [1] 1486/6 forth [3] 1473/21 1481/2 1490/17 1495/3 1509/24 fact [15] 1432/1 1439/21 1440/23 forward [16] 1431/6 1458/16 1459/22 1457/24 1458/2 1470/20 1476/23 Н 1460/21 1461/18 1467/2 1467/11 1485/22 1485/23 1486/1 1486/3 hailed [2] 1470/25 1471/1 1467/19 1475/5 1479/7 1481/11 1492/20 1496/12 1497/3 1500/22 half [1] 1447/25 1481/18 1483/14 1497/24 1501/23 factor [1] 1493/22 hand [4] 1466/14 1466/17 1490/23 1512/6 facts [8] 1455/22 1457/4 1476/15 1493/6 forward -- you [1] 1467/11 1492/4 1495/12 1504/12 1507/4 1508/8 four [3] 1466/22 1502/5 1502/6 handling [2] 1474/17 1491/23 factual [3] 1455/19 1455/19 1507/24 frame [1] 1444/5 hands [1] 1504/8 failed [1] 1490/6 HANS [1] 1426/15 framework [2] 1461/25 1468/14 failing [1] 1506/14 happy [7] 1452/16 1476/24 1479/3 frankly [4] 1428/14 1454/9 1466/14 fair [2] 1455/16 1510/20 1487/17 1500/16 1503/18 1511/4 1510/25 faith [2] 1475/8 1499/21 hard [2] 1460/25 1503/2 fraught [1] 1459/5 fall [3] 1464/2 1468/13 1471/24 has -- not [1] 1466/18 frees [1] 1461/12 falls [2] 1462/19 1489/19 freeze [1] 1498/19 hate [1] 1505/8 familiar [1] 1462/5 frequently [1] 1462/24 heads [1] 1434/16 family [1] 1466/6 friction [1] 1473/12 healthy [1] 1470/8 far [7] 1437/21 1449/19 1451/2 1460/16 Friday [5] 1429/1 1429/12 1429/25 heard [26] 1432/10 1432/17 1432/23 1472/8 1502/4 1504/2 1437/10 1450/2 1450/14 1451/25 1430/1 1500/12 fashioned [1] 1489/17 FRIEDMAN [56] 1452/2 1452/7 1453/18 1453/19 fast [1] 1431/6 1454/17 1455/7 1455/11 1455/25 Friedman's [9] 1458/3 1461/7 1462/11 fault [3] 1485/23 1485/24 1485/25 1463/5 1481/19 1487/21 1488/13 1461/4 1461/14 1466/13 1467/10 favor [2] 1491/8 1491/21 1479/19 1483/6 1483/7 1487/1 1490/25 1492/22 1494/11 Fax [1] 1426/21 1491/4 1498/16 frustrated [1] 1431/9 February [4] 1431/22 1432/11 1433/12 heard -- and [1] 1467/10 frustrating [1] 1444/12 frustration [2] 1428/20 1434/20 heaven [1] 1498/12 February 2016 [1] 1431/22 Fuel [3] 1427/3 1427/3 1427/3 held [3] 1476/10 1477/22 1490/8 February 2nd [1] 1433/12 full [7] 1458/19 1480/18 1498/4 1500/8 HELLER [6] 1427/12 1462/24 1479/22 fee [4] 1432/7 1432/18 1432/20 1447/9 1506/19 1506/21 1507/6 1480/5 1480/19 1484/3 fees [1] 1488/18 fullest [2] 1430/6 1507/7 helpful [1] 1469/21 feet [1] 1492/24 fully [6] 1429/20 1429/23 1433/24 Hersko [2] 1427/11 1427/11 FELDMAN [1] 1427/8 1450/6 1450/7 1450/8 hid [1] 1504/14 few [4] 1430/21 1441/13 1453/12 highest [2] 1449/13 1507/12 Funding [1] 1426/18 1489/20 hire [5] 1466/9 1474/9 1482/24 1489/13 future [1] 1495/6 fight [3] 1468/21 1489/4 1491/18 1489/22 fighting [1] 1488/20 hires [1] 1489/1 figure [6] 1474/18 1496/10 1496/11 Garden [1] 1431/11 hiring [6] 1462/14 1465/16 1466/6 1498/1 1504/17 1509/6 gather [4] 1440/24 1466/18 1497/9 1488/1 1489/12 1492/2 filed [5] 1428/5 1439/20 1444/25 1499/24 historical [1] 1445/22 1456/17 1456/18 history [2] 1442/17 1447/24 gathered [1] 1451/10 fine [5] 1462/1 1474/13 1478/4 1494/6 gathering [1] 1497/21 hit [1] 1429/14 1498/16 general [2] 1462/1 1495/4 hoc [1] 1472/10 fingers [1] 1498/11 generally [3] 1436/24 1463/15 1467/12 home [5] 1448/11 1493/18 1493/21 finish [2] 1463/11 1508/24 generated [1] 1485/20 1512/18 1512/22 FINKEL [4] 1427/6 1436/17 1450/16

1457/25 1460/24 1466/8 1468/10786 96472/24 1478/22 1499/201479/3 1478/14 1478/25 1479/2 1479/8 16 Ħ e 1:15-cv-06861-CBA-JO honest [1] 1491/17 injunctive [2] 1478/24 1481/14 1483/22 1487/18 1492/10 1508/21 honestly [2] 1462/18 1511/20 innocent [2] 1441/19 1499/22 1508/23 1509/8 Honor [109] input [1] 1469/19 judicial [1] 1484/22 Honor's [5] 1454/22 1478/3 1479/13 July [4] 1429/1 1429/12 1445/24 inquiries [1] 1436/21 1479/19 1488/7 insofar [4] 1429/6 1493/13 1493/15 1475/17 HONORABLE [1] 1426/10 1493/17 July 29th [2] 1429/1 1429/12 hope [3] 1435/3 1435/12 1450/6 install [1] 1442/5 July 5th [1] 1445/24 hopeful [2] 1498/12 1498/14 instance [9] 1469/16 1472/1 1478/15 jump [1] 1479/23 hopefully [1] 1472/4 1479/3 1479/20 1480/3 1489/7 1495/4 juncture [1] 1439/7 hour [6] 1427/2 1432/24 1444/19 1504/7 1444/21 1447/25 1448/7 Instead [1] 1490/24 hours [2] 1430/22 1450/11 integrity [1] 1476/20 K-Cups [1] 1484/10 house [1] 1494/21 intend [1] 1444/3 keep [5] 1468/22 1470/7 1470/8 hypothetical [1] 1478/11 intended [1] 1463/20 1491/17 1512/19 intending [2] 1453/13 1489/25 keeping [1] 1494/3 keeps [2] 1446/18 1507/16 intentionally [3] 1441/17 1444/12 ideally [1] 1501/20 kept [6] 1433/17 1448/1 1448/2 1493/25 1448/19 identical [2] 1434/5 1507/22 1496/14 1496/14 intentioned [1] 1460/10 identified [2] 1451/23 1500/11 kicked [3] 1448/12 1448/16 1448/19 interactions [1] 1435/22 identify [5] 1437/7 1446/6 1446/6 1471/4 interest [12] 1462/25 1467/23 1468/3 kinds [1] 1469/17 1472/2 1468/4 1470/7 1475/6 1479/18 1479/19 knowledge [3] 1432/12 1432/14 1436/18 identifying [1] 1445/13 knows [1] 1486/9 1480/5 1486/10 1486/13 1488/24 identity [1] 1487/22 interested [3] 1444/17 1449/5 1461/15 Koenig [2] 1453/16 1453/23 ignorance [2] 1434/24 1498/24 interests [5] 1451/6 1463/2 1474/6 image [8] 1498/18 1498/24 1499/15 1483/6 1507/25 1503/5 1503/6 1503/7 1503/8 1503/12 interfering [2] 1460/9 1481/8 label [1] 1507/18 imaged [3] 1439/22 1457/15 1501/14 internal [1] 1457/21 internet [2] 1430/24 1430/25 Labor [1] 1493/25 images [4] 1457/13 1480/3 1503/2 lack [1] 1460/23 1509/10 laptop [1] 1430/24 interplay [1] 1477/17 imaging [1] 1499/12 large [2] 1436/25 1468/14 interpreting [1] 1467/6 immediately [4] 1429/19 1429/22 lasted [1] 1429/18 interrupt [4] 1445/21 1467/25 1468/17 1431/25 1478/15 late [1] 1500/14 1478/6 impasse [3] 1474/1 1474/24 1476/21 latest [1] 1428/12 interrupted [3] 1430/7 1442/23 1478/7 impede [2] 1460/17 1471/3 interrupting [1] 1442/16 Launch [52] impeding [3] 1460/23 1461/2 1461/22 interval [1] 1470/13 law [1] 1439/14 implicate [1] 1473/6 lawyer [8] 1432/13 1438/2 1438/3 intervening [1] 1428/24 implicates [1] 1467/17 1447/22 1447/23 1475/2 1490/9 1492/4 intervention [1] 1470/11 implication [1] 1443/17 layered [1] 1461/23 investigate [1] 1444/1 implications [1] 1496/12 investigating [1] 1444/17 layered-issues [1] 1461/23 important [3] 1446/17 1471/2 1478/21 lead [2] 1481/12 1505/6 Investors [1] 1426/18 imposes [1] 1492/23 leading [1] 1431/16 invite [1] 1480/11 inarticulate [1] 1482/9 leaning [1] 1437/24 involving [1] 1480/24 Inc [2] 1426/16 1426/19 IP [4] 1437/13 1437/14 1437/18 1442/10 learned [5] 1433/14 1433/22 1435/18 incentive [2] 1500/3 1500/5 ironic [1] 1482/25 1493/14 1493/15 including [2] 1460/6 1512/18 least [8] 1437/4 1437/21 1441/6 1457/13 issue [52] inconsistent [1] 1438/25 issued [3] 1437/8 1438/10 1489/24 1471/21 1474/8 1483/7 1505/17 inconvenience [1] 1509/1 issues [25] 1439/12 1441/12 1450/9 leave [7] 1440/6 1440/15 1440/23 indefinitely [2] 1496/18 1497/21 1463/21 1463/22 1508/16 1511/5 1451/19 1452/8 1454/25 1455/1 1455/2 independence [1] 1491/25 1455/6 1455/21 1456/9 1456/21 leaving [1] 1487/18 independent [7] 1435/15 1466/4 1474/2 left [2] 1431/5 1512/19 1457/17 1458/25 1461/23 1477/20 1487/8 1487/9 1487/24 1490/20 legitimate [1] 1451/6 1487/18 1494/9 1495/9 1496/9 1499/17 independently [3] 1475/11 1477/11 1500/18 1506/25 1507/24 1511/18 less [1] 1492/16 1488/18 letter [5] 1428/5 1444/3 1504/11 1511/7 item [3] 1477/15 1479/12 1482/4 indicate [2] 1433/6 1493/17 items [1] 1477/16 1511/21 individual [2] 1488/16 1488/22 letters [1] 1473/25 individually [1] 1490/3 letting [2] 1444/13 1461/13 inference [4] 1440/9 1440/10 1440/25 level [6] 1441/22 1449/14 1491/15 JAMES [1] 1426/10 1448/21 1506/20 1507/10 1507/12 JAY [4] 1426/14 1439/11 1440/2 inferences [1] 1506/4 1445/21 levels [1] 1507/12 influence [1] 1434/8 light [7] 1427/4 1428/17 1435/22 Jersey [8] 1436/24 1439/8 1440/7 informal [1] 1513/9 1440/15 1484/17 1484/23 1493/24 1452/18 1452/19 1454/6 1454/6 information [64] likely [1] 1450/15 1494/3 information -- if [1] 1479/13 limited [2] 1504/21 1507/1 Jeryg [1] 1426/19 information-gathering [1] 1497/21 JO [1] 1426/3 LINDA [1] 1426/20 initial [2] 1442/3 1503/20 LindaDan226 [1] 1426/22 join [3] 1439/5 1439/7 1439/9 injunction [22] 1454/4 1460/7 1460/15 line [3] 1435/18 1437/3 1476/18 joint [1] 1510/4 1460/24 1461/10 1461/12 1463/18 lines [1] 1506/23 Jorge [1] 1427/7 1464/14 1467/8 1467/18 1468/7 judge [17] 1426/11 1457/6 1457/18 list [1] 1473/23 1469/18 1470/6 1477/18 1477/25

<u>e 1:15-cv-06861-CBA-JO</u> listen [1] 1493/13 lists [2] 1473/19 1473/24 litigant [3] 1475/3 1475/24 1476/3 litigants [1] 1494/25 litigate [3] 1468/9 1497/20 1507/3 litigating [1] 1468/22 litigation [6] 1472/19 1473/6 1477/3 1484/19 1491/8 1497/24 LLC [7] 1426/18 1426/18 1426/19 1427/14 1427/15 1427/17 1471/5 loaded [1] 1445/9 loading [2] 1513/6 1513/7 loans [1] 1441/7 locked [2] 1442/11 1459/6 log [5] 1448/11 1448/17 1448/22 1449/16 1449/18 login [2] 1446/20 1446/22 long-scheduled [1] 1504/5 looked [2] 1437/11 1474/23 lost [1] 1457/23 loyalty [1] 1475/23

M

luxury [1] 1460/13

machine [1] 1489/2 machinery [3] 1462/19 1463/8 1465/10 machines [2] 1461/4 1464/1 magistrate [2] 1426/11 1478/22 Mahal [1] 1478/12 mail [7] 1491/23 1492/21 1493/4 1493/13 1493/14 1493/21 1493/23 mailing [2] 1493/1 1494/23 mailings [2] 1493/15 1493/17 mails [4] 1490/24 1490/24 1491/3 1493/12 maintain [2] 1470/6 1498/19 major [9] 1431/21 1433/6 1434/2 1463/4 1465/10 1467/20 1469/14 1470/24 1471/18 majority [3] 1465/6 1466/5 1476/3 management [3] 1426/19 1426/19 1465/7 mangle [1] 1436/12 manipulate [1] 1441/11 manipulated [1] 1446/15 manufacturer [1] 1484/12 map [2] 1483/14 1483/17 March [1] 1457/6 March 9th [1] 1457/6 marketing [1] 1433/7 mask [1] 1445/17 match [2] 1443/7 1443/8 material [3] 1441/2 1442/15 1445/6 matter [4] 1485/24 1486/24 1488/11 1505/14 matters [9] 1434/25 1435/4 1459/13 1464/9 1466/19 1467/20 1468/13 1476/17 1478/23 MAURICE [1] 1427/12 MB [2] 1427/3 1427/3 McCormick [1] 1466/8 me -- again [1] 1500/16 mean [10] 1439/23 1440/21 1445/20 1463/6 1478/6 1482/18 1483/5 1491/10 1495/20 1496/22 meaning [5] 1445/8 1485/5 1495/23 1496/4 1498/12 meaningful [1] 1496/13 means [3] 1480/12 1488/13 1510/16

meant [1] -1478/18 Hechanica (1) 1 F26/24 11/02/16 mechanism [1] 1512/23 meet [4] 1473/18 1473/18 1511/1 1511/4 meeting [1] 1472/2 member [5] 1466/7 1476/4 1482/11 1485/8 1485/9 members [13] 1453/24 1465/6 1466/6 1466/6 1466/7 1466/9 1466/22 1471/5 1471/16 1477/1 1479/14 1482/3 1490/11 members' [1] 1474/22 mentioned [4] 1437/15 1450/17 1453/15 1479/21 messenger [1] 1512/21 methodology [1] 1475/14 Michael [2] 1427/9 1427/9 middle [1] 1465/21 Middlesex [1] 1466/8 might [4] 1444/25 1469/24 1477/2 1512/24 mind [6] 1463/11 1468/13 1475/4

1487/16 1493/24 1495/9
minority [1] 1485/9
minute [2] 1469/2 1470/13
minutes [5] 1440/17 1448/12 1489/20
1492/18 1511/3
miraculously [1] 1440/5
Miss Nelkin [1] 1439/2
missed [1] 1441/21
missing [1] 1440/8
mission [1] 1477/7
mistake [1] 1499/22
mode [1] 1497/21
model [1] 1444/5
moment [8] 1450/22 1452/3 1452/6

1464/12 1467/5 1497/10 1498/20 1509/21 momentarily [1] 1435/13 Monday [4] 1428/21 1444/8 1505/1

Monday [4] 1428/21 1444/8 1505/18 1509/16

money [5] 1488/20 1489/2 1489/3 1489/5 1489/6

monitoring [1] 1448/23 month [1] 1433/10

months [3] 1445/3 1471/21 1473/18 morning [11] 1428/5 1428/9 1428/15 1428/18 1431/8 1433/22 1434/18 1435/13 1450/4 1454/9 1498/10 morning's [2] 1435/5 1453/8 most [10] 1434/10 1442/24 1448/21 1451/25 1452/2 1469/10 1474/1 1480/25 1490/19 1490/21 motion [9] 1456/7 1456/8 1456/10 1456/16 1456/16 1456/17 1456/24

1456/16 1456/16 1456/17 1456/2 1458/1 1472/24

motions [1] 1456/25 move [1] 1497/24

moving [1] 1495/11

Mr. Devine [2] 1494/3 1494/11

Mr. Devine's [1] 1493/25

Mr. Finkel [3] 1436/17 1450/16 1454/13

Mr. Friedman [53]

Mr. Friedman's [9] 1458/3 1461/7 1462/11 1463/5 1481/19 1487/21 1488/13 1492/22 1494/11

Mr. Grantz [1] 1436/14

Mr. Greenblatt [3] 1474/13 1491/24 1492/3

Mr. Heller [5], 1462/24 1479/22 1489/5
Mr. Koenig [2] 1453/16 1453/23
Mr. Nelkin [12] 1428/5 1430/3 1430/8
1430/12 1436/22 1441/24 1449/22
1456/18 1469/25 1494/15 1507/6
1507/16

Mr. Nelkin's [1] 1498/6 Mr. Nussbaum [1] 1448/1

Mr. Nussbaum's [2] 1447/22 1447/23 Mr. Papa [33] 1453/15 1453/18 1459/4 1459/7 1459/14 1459/16 1459/17 1460/11 1460/19 1461/7 1461/12 1461/18 1463/8 1466/13 1466/17 1466/18 1466/25 1471/5 1471/20 1474/3 1474/10 1474/17 1475/3 1477/7 1482/21 1489/25 1490/2 1490/24 1491/12 1491/16 1491/21 1493/3 1494/24

Mr. Papa's [5] 1459/3 1460/1 1474/21 1492/19 1507/2

Mr. Parness [11] 1462/4 1471/14 1473/23 1474/13 1475/16 1475/17 1476/17 1476/19 1477/8 1491/24 1492/3

Mr. Rogosnitzky [3] 1428/15 1431/10 1508/1

Mr. Rosenblatt [4] 1462/3 1482/16 1487/2 1502/5

Mr. Schafhauser [12] 1439/19 1441/18 1443/20 1452/5 1456/6 1458/1 1458/7 1489/25 1494/17 1495/8 1500/4 1501/24

Mr. Schafhauser's [1] 1446/12 Mr. Schreiber [9] 1449/15 1449/17 1452/17 1453/6 1453/16 1453/20 1477/3 1488/23 1489/8

Mr. Schreiber's [1] 1453/22

Ms. Guy [1] 1513/5

Ms. Nelkin [13] 1430/8 1430/12 1431/6 1433/14 1436/22 1439/10 1443/12 1449/22 1452/16 1456/4 1456/18 1469/25 1473/20

Ms. Pastrikos [1] 1430/23 Ms. Rivera [1] 1507/23 multiple [2] 1441/14 1477/25 must [1] 1439/12 my -- one [1] 1467/12

N

names [3] 1473/19 1473/20 1473/20 near [1] 1485/25 necessary [4] 1469/20 1478/12 1478/13 1480/9 necessity [3] 1460/13 1463/9 1467/16 need [55] need -- and [1] 1479/11 needed [7] 1442/9 1442/10 1442/14 1480/7 1489/23 1491/7 1507/1 Needless [2] 1492/12 1493/14 needs [22] 1437/6 1459/6 1459/14 1460/13 1460/16 1461/8 1463/14 1467/2 1467/14 1468/2 1470/8 1471/2 1471/7 1474/18 1474/24 1477/6 1481/17 1484/4 1490/10 1494/4 1499/8 1499/10 negotiate [1] 1470/9

NELKIN [29] 1426/14 1426/14 1428/5 1430/3 1430/8 1430/8 1430/12 1430/12 1431/6 1433/14 1436/22 1436/22 ase 1:15-cv-06861-CBA-JO 1474/20 1477/17-1477/23 1479/16 1480/23 1481/3 F481/4 1480/4516 1496/12 1507/3 ger 46 pf 1483 PageID #: 12788 NELKIN... [17] 1439/2 1439/10 1439/11 1481/22 1482/11 1489/15 1489/21 partly [1] 1499/18 1441/24 1443/12 1449/22 1449/22 operation [2] 1481/11 1507/2 partner [1] 1488/19 1452/16 1456/4 1456/18 1456/18 operational [1] 1492/18 partners [6] 1459/5 1460/6 1461/20 1469/25 1469/25 1473/20 1494/15 operations [10] 1460/9 1461/2 1461/22 1470/10 1471/16 1473/7 1507/6 1507/16 1465/7 1469/11 1469/14 1471/15 party [4] 1436/13 1436/15 1436/15 Nelkin's [1] 1498/6 1474/18 1481/8 1483/9 1477/2 never [5] 1439/14 1449/12 1458/7 opinion [4] 1462/7 1485/19 1486/24 passes [1] 1450/22 1506/17 1508/16 1499/8 password [7] 1442/13 1447/2 1448/14 next [10] 1451/17 1458/14 1458/22 oppose [1] 1452/21 1448/20 1449/11 1449/13 1449/14 1458/22 1464/16 1479/12 1495/9 opposed [1] 1504/22 passwords [4] 1442/13 1446/23 1447/25 1500/12 1502/7 1504/3 opposite [1] 1488/23 1507/7 nice [1] 1512/15 past [2] 1472/4 1483/3 order [11] 1437/8 1438/10 1439/5 night [7] 1429/4 1430/9 1436/11 1441/2 1457/7 1457/12 1457/13 PASTRIKOS [2] 1426/18 1430/23 1440/18 1441/17 1449/23 1452/21 1457/16 1478/23 1484/5 1508/12 path [1] 1443/11 nobody [1] 1471/15 ordered [2] 1439/21 1442/4 PAUL [1] 1426/15 non [1] 1478/23 orders [2] 1451/4 1455/14 pause [2] 1475/19 1493/7 non-dispositive [1] 1478/23 ORENSTEIN [3] 1426/10 1457/25 pay [2] 1488/18 1495/5 noncompete [1] 1484/7 1468/10 paying [1] 1489/5 noncompliance [1] 1451/4 original [5] 1431/23 1434/12 1446/12 payments [2] 1456/1 1481/2 none [1] 1441/14 1499/2 1503/7 payroll [1] 1441/5 noon [1] 1513/11 originally [1] 1496/14 pays [1] 1489/2 normally [1] 1481/22 pending [3] 1456/8 1457/1 1472/24 otherwise [2] 1473/2 1482/12 note [2] 1446/17 1511/14 per [2] 1466/6 1466/21 our -- I'm [1] 1465/17 notes [6] 1431/19 1433/6 1433/12 percent [1] 1476/3 ourselves [3] 1429/5 1476/21 1509/6 1433/13 1505/21 1511/17 outside [4] 1465/17 1485/3 1494/9 perfectly [1] 1462/10 nothing [5] 1439/21 1443/20 1451/19 1505/15 perhaps [1] 1469/21 1473/5 1491/23 overlaid [1] 1456/14 period [7] 1428/24 1432/6 1433/11 notice [3] 1458/3 1463/19 1468/8 override [1] 1474/14 1442/25 1443/19 1444/19 1447/1 notwithstanding [1] 1481/15 overtaken [1] 1451/13 periods [1] 1443/8 nowhere [1] 1485/25 own [5] 1446/7 1450/19 1480/20 1482/9 permission [3] 1442/11 1468/6 1511/22 number [10] 1428/6 1429/15 1430/10 1507/25 permit [1] 1494/6 1438/6 1450/9 1450/10 1456/14 person [9] 1435/19 1437/7 1442/10 owns [3] 1479/18 1479/19 1491/18 1457/11 1466/17 1479/19 1460/3 1460/3 1466/25 1474/10 Р Nussbaum [1] 1448/1 1476/22 1510/9 Nussbaum's [2] 1447/22 1447/23 P.C [1] 1427/11 personal [1] 1432/12 page 10 [1] 1464/11 personally [3] 1429/7 1476/7 1476/13 Papa [33] 1453/15 1453/18 1459/4 persons [1] 1433/8 object [4] 1472/18 1483/11 1488/2 1459/7 1459/14 1459/16 1459/17 perspective [1] 1454/21 1493/18 1460/11 1460/19 1461/7 1461/12 persuade [1] 1491/21 objection [3] 1474/14 1493/6 1505/19 phantom [1] 1454/15 1461/18 1463/8 1466/13 1466/17 objects [1] 1487/23 1466/18 1466/25 1471/5 1471/20 PHILIP [1] 1426/14 obligations [2] 1454/3 1490/6 1474/3 1474/10 1474/17 1475/3 1477/7 phone [7] 1426/21 1429/15 1429/21 observed [1] 1444/25 1482/21 1489/25 1490/2 1490/24 1431/5 1431/11 1459/13 1503/21 obtain [2] 1429/2 1441/2 1491/12 1491/16 1491/21 1493/3 phrase [2] 1482/6 1497/2 obtained [3] 1476/2 1476/10 1480/3 1494/24 physical [1] 1437/6 obvious [3] 1480/11 1486/12 1493/16 Papa's [5] 1459/3 1460/1 1474/21 Physically [1] 1436/8 obviously [8] 1449/24 1451/2 1453/6 PI [1] 1464/4 1492/19 1507/2 1483/10 1501/5 1503/3 1503/4 1507/11 paper [2] 1455/22 1455/23 pick [2] 1475/2 1512/25 occurs [2] 1453/21 1498/15 paragraph [4] 1462/14 1465/21 1467/18 picture [1] 1498/19 OCR [1] 1426/20 1487/14 piece [1] 1434/13 October [2] 1442/5 1442/14 paranoia [1] 1446/3 pieces [2] 1455/22 1455/23 October 1st [1] 1442/5 paranoid [1] 1446/5 Piscataway [3] 1436/23 1437/15 1439/8 October 2nd [1] 1442/14 Park [1] 1427/5 place [4] 1437/15 1449/7 1494/10 office [6] 1427/14 1462/25 1484/10 Parkway [1] 1431/12 1495/22 1493/3 1494/1 1494/24 Parness [11] 1462/4 1471/14 1473/23 placing [1] 1430/1 officer [3] 1434/10 1434/15 1435/23 1474/13 1475/16 1475/17 1476/17 plaintiff [21] 1426/4 1426/14 1428/14 official [1] 1495/1 1476/19 1477/8 1491/24 1492/3 1434/13 1435/5 1450/4 1452/20 officially [1] 1493/2 part [13] 1455/5 1456/15 1456/19 1452/23 1453/21 1466/20 1471/13 Oil [2] 1427/2 1427/4 1456/24 1457/2 1458/1 1461/8 1483/12 1473/17 1473/23 1480/2 1480/6 online [1] 1445/16 1484/14 1485/1 1496/8 1505/4 1506/1 1495/14 1498/12 1499/12 1500/13 open [8] 1428/1 1451/14 1456/21 parte [4] 1463/22 1468/6 1468/7 1482/6 1500/18 1511/2 1468/22 1493/16 1494/19 1495/19 participate [1] 1499/16 plaintiff's [5] 1435/13 1452/2 1454/3 1500/24 participating [1] 1490/20 1456/23 1511/4 opening [1] 1490/24 particular [6] 1436/23 1471/20 1482/4 plaintiffs [5] 1456/3 1488/16 1488/16 operate [3] 1470/5 1477/6 1481/18 1485/19 1500/16 1500/25 1501/9 1508/7 operating [27] 1455/8 1455/14 1460/5 particularly [3] 1454/6 1454/6 1472/9 plaintiffs -- I'm [1] 1488/16 1460/17 1461/6 1461/19 1462/8 parties [9] 1457/11 1460/8 1462/9 plan [1] 1496/9 1462/23 1463/2 1464/11 1469/10 1468/22 1473/25 1480/5 1488/23 planning [2] 1453/9 1472/2 1469/15 1471/15 1472/23 1473/1

privilege [2] 1431/20 1476/10 2/16 privilege [7] 1476/16 11/02/16 1496/9 e 1:15-cv-06861-CBA-JO geite760t 49922 age/A #4712789 plans [1] 1504/5 problem [15] 1447/6 1447/18 1447/19 1481/7 1495/21 1507/11 plate [1] 1479/25 1462/21 1462/22 1463/5 1465/23 quo [1] 1481/5 pleasure [1] 1512/12 1485/15 1486/17 1486/18 1488/15 quote [1] 1434/2 plug [1] 1442/8 1490/5 1500/21 1502/2 1503/20 plug-in [1] 1442/8 problematic [1] 1464/5 plugged [1] 1445/8 raised [5] 1475/16 1480/4 1498/11 problems [2] 1494/12 1495/6 point [32] 1430/4 1430/17 1431/4 1507/24 1511/18 proceed [5] 1449/25 1457/8 1484/21 1434/14 1436/17 1440/8 1457/23 raising [2] 1456/20 1508/2 1487/10 1495/19 1467/15 1470/5 1470/5 1473/16 proceeding [6] 1450/9 1454/22 1484/18 RAPHAEL [1] 1427/16 1474/10 1480/1 1480/6 1480/16 1484/23 1490/21 1513/8 rather [6] 1459/15 1468/13 1472/10 1480/20 1480/21 1484/19 1485/25 proceedings [3] 1426/24 1444/10 1475/1 1491/2 1494/25 1488/6 1489/3 1496/10 1496/15 1497/7 reach [4] 1444/3 1469/22 1473/21 1444/18 1497/11 1497/22 1498/5 1498/6 process [5] 1434/19 1450/25 1486/16 1488/10 1498/11 1499/24 1504/20 1509/18 reactivated [2] 1429/10 1429/14 1486/23 1500/6 pointed [2] 1466/21 1477/24 produce [1] 1458/4 read [6] 1428/9 1454/9 1455/14 1455/14 points [7] 1430/12 1431/15 1435/21 produced [1] 1426/24 1465/20 1477/25 1442/1 1443/14 1455/25 1509/9 producing [1] 1509/21 readily [2] 1448/21 1512/4 portion [1] 1506/19 production [3] 1457/7 1457/10 1457/18 reading [1] 1465/4 position [18] 1455/8 1456/7 1456/23 real [1] 1492/23 productions [1] 1458/11 1458/10 1462/13 1466/16 1472/16 prohibits [1] 1460/8 really [14] 1431/16 1432/9 1436/18 1472/22 1472/23 1473/10 1476/5 prominently [1] 1450/17 1439/25 1441/15 1453/3 1454/16 1478/9 1478/10 1478/22 1480/6 properly [1] 1483/18 1455/24 1463/7 1471/16 1473/10 1489/21 1490/16 1490/18 property [2] 1429/6 1438/7 1473/10 1480/18 1480/21 positions [1] 1473/1 proposal [2] 1487/10 1500/17 Realty [1] 1427/4 possession [2] 1441/10 1509/23 propose [3] 1478/2 1478/14 1501/11 reason [18] 1438/15 1462/11 1463/19 possible [2] 1481/19 1507/8 proposed [1] 1475/3 1467/21 1468/16 1468/19 1475/7 post [1] 1472/10 1475/23 1477/7 1481/13 1481/21 proposing [2] 1474/25 1487/7 potential [2] 1472/4 1486/12 1484/5 1484/14 1484/18 1486/14 proprietary [5] 1462/25 1463/1 1480/5 potentially [2] 1450/19 1476/4 1493/1 1501/17 1504/4 1480/7 1480/8 powers [1] 1481/14 reasonable [1] 1462/10 protective [3] 1457/12 1457/12 1457/16 practice [1] 1439/14 protocol [1] 1456/22 reasons [2] 1467/21 1493/16 prayers [1] 1498/11 prove [2] 1454/18 1454/18 reasons -- and [1] 1467/21 preclude [1] 1481/20 receive [2] 1482/3 1493/21 proven [1] 1503/19 predicated [1] 1506/10 provide [11] 1428/13 1449/12 1500/8 received [1] 1450/11 preferably [1] 1503/8 1500/9 1501/7 1505/14 1506/7 1506/12 recent [1] 1442/25 prejudge [1] 1481/16 recently [2] 1433/23 1442/18 1508/6 1509/13 1510/10 prejudice [5] 1452/20 1468/8 1472/25 recess [5] 1440/21 1441/1 1448/9 provided [8] 1449/12 1473/24 1502/4 1481/13 1481/19 1470/16 1472/14 1506/2 1507/6 1507/14 1508/6 1510/8 prejudiced [3] 1449/22 1450/1 1468/4 provides [4] 1448/22 1449/19 1477/24 recognition [1] 1470/19 preliminarily [1] 1468/6 recognize [2] 1496/16 1497/7 1501/8 preliminary [19] 1454/4 1460/7 1460/15 recognized [1] 1483/5 providing [5] 1432/7 1459/11 1473/8 1460/24 1461/10 1461/11 1463/18 1505/13 1506/8 recommend [1] 1479/4 1464/13 1467/8 1467/18 1469/18 proving [1] 1441/9 recommendation [2] 1487/18 1492/11 1470/6 1477/17 1477/25 1478/14 provision [2] 1466/20 1479/1 recommended [1] 1479/8 1478/25 1484/16 1487/14 1492/22 reconfirm [1] 1458/8 provisions [2] 1460/10 1505/22 prelude [2] 1480/15 1480/21 pulled [1] 1431/18 reconvene [1] 1452/23 premature [1] 1467/15 reconvening [1] 1504/7 purchasing [2] 1462/19 1463/8 prematurely [1] 1467/13 purely [1] 1478/11 record [13] 1430/4 1449/1 1472/22 prepare [1] 1503/2 1477/23 1486/25 1487/13 1494/2 purportedly [1] 1434/17 prepared [5] 1452/17 1455/13 1458/6 purporting [1] 1459/12 1497/25 1498/4 1505/15 1506/2 1506/9 1487/9 1504/3 purpose [1] 1451/15 1508/5 prepares [1] 1500/19 purposes [3] 1446/16 1460/21 1479/6 recorded [1] 1426/24 present [7] 1452/24 1453/9 1455/3 pursue [1] 1496/18 records [8] 1441/5 1441/5 1493/25 1455/7 1478/15 1478/16 1495/14 pursuing [1] 1495/9 1494/3 1494/10 1496/14 1504/23 presented [3] 1452/5 1455/23 1455/23 1505/4 pushing [1] 1480/6 presents [1] 1495/14 reestablish [1] 1496/13 put [13] 1434/16 1442/12 1454/1 1454/8 preserve [2] 1451/23 1491/7 1463/20 1471/24 1472/22 1477/23 referring [3] 1430/14 1440/23 1501/18 preserved [2] 1439/22 1496/23 refreshingly [1] 1475/4 1483/25 1484/5 1486/21 1499/12 presumption [1] 1482/2 refused [3] 1438/23 1442/12 1442/13 1500/12 presumptively [1] 1482/11 putting [3] 1445/16 1453/7 1491/5 refusing [1] 1490/18 pretrial [1] 1478/23 regard [7] 1441/5 1441/6 1441/7 prevent [1] 1481/14 1482/18 1496/22 1499/11 1506/8 prevented [1] 1429/5 qualified [1] 1474/8 regarding [3] 1435/5 1495/9 1505/14 previously [2] 1428/18 1435/6 registration [1] 1495/1 qualifiers [1] 1472/20 primary [1] 1458/5 questions [6] 1447/16 1453/25 1459/3 reimbursement [1] 1499/25 principals [1] 1459/11 related [2] 1459/25 1511/24 1483/8 1491/14 1491/14 principle [1] 1495/5 QuickBooks [1] 1442/8 relates [1] 1456/18 priority [2] 1458/21 1490/25 quickly [4] 1487/1 1487/12 1487/17 relating [1] 1466/3

Re 1:15-cv-06861-CBA-JO 1430/5 1431/7 1433/24 1442/20 1446/18 1505/23 lied 11/02/16 second [7] 1447/12 1465/3,1465/3 964739944396 150998 1511/75790 relative [1] 1465/15 restoring [2] 1428/22 1458/19 second -- well [1] 1473/9 relaying [1] 1493/8 restrain [1] 1481/7 section [3] 1464/10 1465/20 1465/22 relevant [2] 1442/2 1465/5 restricted [1] 1449/17 section -- it's [1] 1465/20 reliable [1] 1497/17 seek [3] 1499/25 1501/10 1506/15 restrictions [2] 1492/23 1507/13 relief [5] 1455/3 1478/24 1501/9 rests [1] 1452/23 seeking [4] 1455/3 1461/8 1461/10 1504/13 1508/8 result [4] 1458/25 1470/24 1479/5 1508/7 remain [2] 1450/23 1494/19 1499/22 seem [1] 1461/17 remainder [1] 1453/9 retain [3] 1436/2 1460/20 1482/22 segregation [1] 1480/7 remained [1] 1431/23 selling [2] 1433/7 1468/15 retained [1] 1466/18 remains [3] 1440/15 1457/16 1506/13 retaining [2] 1465/9 1465/12 send [3] 1494/10 1504/10 1509/14 remarks [1] 1500/4 return [1] 1503/12 sense [3] 1451/11 1451/13 1459/9 remedies [1] 1498/1 returned [3] 1443/5 1502/5 1502/6 sent [2] 1459/4 1492/21 remedy [4] 1487/19 1489/17 1506/14 review [1] 1450/6 separate [3] 1454/25 1465/11 1505/5 1506/15 revisit [1] 1452/10 separately [1] 1456/24 remember [3] 1445/24 1447/17 1511/20 revolve [1] 1440/14 September [6] 1442/3 1508/20 1508/22 remote [2] 1446/20 1495/24 RICHARD [2] 1427/6 1427/8 1508/24 1508/25 1509/2 rents [1] 1436/16 rights [6] 1460/6 1467/17 1472/25 September 12th [1] 1509/2 repeatedly [2] 1431/7 1457/23 September 25th [1] 1442/3 1473/1 1477/24 1488/14 report [11] 1433/2 1439/20 1500/20 rise [1] 1483/8 September 7th [1] 1508/24 1501/8 1501/9 1501/14 1504/9 1504/10 rising [1] 1438/17 September 9th [3] 1508/20 1508/22 1508/7 1510/8 1510/10 risk [1] 1463/21 1508/25 Reporter [1] 1426/20 Rivera [2] 1427/7 1507/23 serious [1] 1451/25 reports [2] 1450/14 1504/3 Rivers [63] serve [2] 1427/13 1506/11 represent [9] 1431/19 1469/7 1469/25 Rivers -- you're [1] 1469/6 served [1] 1451/15 1474/6 1474/19 1476/6 1476/22 Rivers' [5] 1429/6 1469/1 1483/9 1492/5 server [14] 1436/7 1437/5 1438/22 1489/22 1507/20 1494/24 1439/6 1442/10 1442/11 1445/10 represent -- defend [1] 1474/6 road [2] 1431/18 1494/12 1496/1 1496/2 1500/7 1501/21 1508/12 representation [2] 1436/23 1446/13 ROBERT [1] 1427/10 1509/19 1509/22 representative [1] 1435/24 Service [1] 1463/1 Rogosnitzky [6] 1428/15 1431/10 represented [7] 1434/7 1475/18 1475/20 1434/16 1498/10 1507/20 1508/1 Services [2] 1427/15 1484/10 1475/22 1476/13 1506/18 1512/7 roof [1] 1429/14 serving [1] 1508/1 representing [1] 1476/16 room [5] 1430/9 1430/15 1430/21 set [5] 1481/2 1495/12 1496/3 1496/4 request [4] 1475/10 1477/9 1477/11 1430/22 1474/8 1501/5 1477/13 ROSENBLATT [5] 1427/16 1462/3 setting [1] 1447/2 require [6] 1461/20 1466/7 1470/10 1482/16 1487/2 1502/5 settings [1] 1489/22 1471/25 1505/5 1506/16 RPR [1] 1426/20 settlement [1] 1473/11 required [3] 1461/7 1489/16 1490/14 run [5] 1460/16 1461/23 1466/25 1474/9 seven [2] 1432/17 1481/6 requires [4] 1460/17 1462/8 1462/15 1486/11 several [4] 1430/12 1433/16 1443/4 1483/15 running [7] 1459/7 1462/23 1468/23 1492/18 resemble [1] 1484/11 1470/8 1474/11 1488/21 1491/17 shall [2] 1466/5 1466/7 reset [1] 1501/6 rushing [1] 1511/6 shared [4] 1481/12 1481/21 1483/18 residence [2] 1492/22 1494/12 1488/24 resident [2] 1436/7 1501/21 S sharing [1] 1512/1 resides [1] 1500/8 safest [1] 1461/17 short [3] 1444/19 1497/6 1510/23 resolution [4] 1455/19 1457/17 1479/6 Salcedo [1] 1427/7 short-term [1] 1497/6 1489/4 sanction [1] 1487/19 shorthand [1] 1508/5 resolve [16] 1448/7 1452/7 1461/16 sat [2] 1447/25 1491/11 shortly [1] 1440/3 1463/13 1463/18 1467/6 1468/17 save [1] 1496/6 side [17] 1431/18 1432/18 1447/6 1468/24 1473/14 1474/12 1474/24 scattered [1] 1458/16 1451/11 1453/10 1454/2 1454/25 1484/1 1494/13 1495/15 1496/9 1497/5 SCHAFHAUSER [14] 1426/15 1439/19 1455/2 1455/18 1456/2 1456/10 1461/3 resolved [7] 1447/9 1459/1 1478/25 1441/18 1443/20 1452/5 1456/6 1458/1 1486/7 1490/21 1491/8 1491/22 1483/21 1496/11 1511/3 1512/4 1458/7 1470/17 1489/25 1494/17 1495/11 resolving [2] 1473/11 1486/16 1495/8 1500/4 1501/24 sides [6] 1436/1 1457/8 1457/18 respect [9] 1439/6 1450/10 1452/18 Schafhauser's [1] 1446/12 1468/20 1488/23 1512/6 1460/11 1472/23 1500/10 1503/3 schedule [6] 1458/14 1458/22 1495/13 Signature [1] 1494/19 1506/25 1509/18 1503/20 1504/19 1508/20 significance [1] 1473/15 respectfully [8] 1474/1 1474/4 1481/1 scheduled [1] 1504/5 significant [3] 1451/3 1483/8 1496/21 1482/13 1487/23 1490/19 1490/21 schedules [1] 1503/23 significantly [1] 1483/6 1501/13 scheduling [1] 1504/20 similarly [1] 1477/1 respects [1] 1460/10 SCHREIBER [11] 1426/3 1449/15 simply [6] 1431/20 1435/15 1439/13 respond [6] 1446/9 1450/12 1473/3 1449/17 1451/18 1452/17 1453/6 1445/2 1445/7 1446/10 1487/4 1501/13 1508/10 1453/16 1453/20 1477/3 1488/23 Single [1] 1427/13 response [9] 1435/15 1448/23 1450/18 1489/8 sit [3] 1453/4 1457/9 1471/12 1450/20 1452/24 1453/8 1480/11 Schreiber's [1] 1453/22 site [1] 1444/24 1480/18 1504/15 scribble [1] 1431/18 sitting [1] 1511/6 responsible [2] 1459/7 1489/5 search [1] 1456/22 situation [2] 1459/5 1462/6 rest [1] 1477/5 seat [1] 1512/5 sketch [1] 1469/16 restored [9] 1429/3 1429/20 1429/23 seated [1] 1428/2 slightest [1] 1491/9

Techn [1] 1458/3 ageID #: 12791 Street [1] -1427/4 e 1:15-cv-06861-CBA-JO 31102942133356/1-11439/1-1-1439/2-4 software [5] 1435/8 1442/6 1442/12 temporarily [1] 1442/20 1440/2 1440/15 1440/17 1440/24 1447/7 1447/20 1441/22 1443/25 1444/8 1445/5 1446/9 tension [1] 1463/13 solicit [1] 1461/21 1446/19 1446/24 1448/15 1448/18 term [1] 1497/6 solicited [1] 1462/11 1448/24 1450/13 1450/14 1454/14 terms [8] 1434/11 1436/12 1456/22 soliciting [1] 1464/5 1454/14 1495/13 1495/15 1497/2 1459/11 1459/13 1459/14 1492/10 solicits [1] 1460/22 1498/15 1498/17 1498/21 1498/25 1506/8 Solomon [1] 1427/13 1500/11 1500/13 1500/15 1500/19 testifies [1] 1453/7 solution [2] 1468/5 1496/8 1500/22 1501/8 1501/15 1503/1 1503/4 testimonial [1] 1450/18 someone [10] 1448/18 1448/22 1475/11 1504/9 1508/6 1509/11 1509/14 1510/8 testimony [27] 1432/10 1450/16 1451/10 1477/10 1478/11 1487/8 1487/9 1451/16 1451/25 1452/3 1452/5 1452/6 Stroz's [1] 1501/14 1490/20 1492/6 1510/13 struggling [1] 1463/12 1452/9 1453/22 1454/17 1454/23 somewhat [2] 1443/11 1463/4 stuff [1] 1448/16 1455/25 1459/3 1460/12 1460/21 somewhere [2] 1437/5 1439/8 1461/14 1471/23 1475/4 1479/19 stupid [1] 1440/1 Sonia [2] 1427/7 1449/18 subject [3] 1438/9 1484/22 1501/5 1481/6 1483/7 1490/25 1491/4 1492/19 Sonia's [3] 1449/13 1449/14 1449/20 submission [6] 1435/5 1435/13 1441/21 1504/20 1509/20 soon [1] 1512/17 1444/7 1446/24 1453/8 that -- and [1] 1472/21 sorry [14] 1442/21 1447/15 1456/12 submissions [5] 1444/8 1454/8 1455/17 themselves [1] 1443/7 1457/6 1463/12 1463/25 1464/14 1506/10 1508/7 theories [2] 1444/23 1446/7 1468/1 1468/16 1468/18 1478/8 submit [4] 1450/15 1450/18 1474/4 theory [1] 1445/13 1485/24 1488/16 1499/5 1482/13 thereafter [1] 1496/17 sort [6] 1443/11 1447/6 1461/23 therefore [1] 1473/6 submitted [2] 1450/14 1473/25 1474/10 1499/20 1504/24 subpoena [7] 1437/8 1438/9 1438/10 they've [3] 1442/1 1449/16 1506/18 sought [1] 1480/2 sounds [2] 1448/18 1450/21 thinking [1] 1494/10 1439/5 1458/2 1489/24 1510/4 Subsection [2] 1465/22 1466/2 thinks [5] 1451/8 1451/15 1461/18 source [1] 1461/6 space [1] 1436/25 subsequent [1] 1498/9 1467/3 1468/23 substantive [1] 1458/15 third [7] 1436/13 1436/15 1436/15 speaking [6] 1436/18 1462/4 1469/6 substituting [1] 1462/4 1462/7 1464/11 1465/20 1465/21 1470/2 1471/4 1472/15 succeed [1] 1488/24 successfully [1] 1445/17 third-party [3] 1436/13 1436/15 1436/15 specific [4] 1462/9 1472/1 1482/1 thoughts [1] 1461/24 1483/25 sudden [1] 1480/8 suffices [1] 1433/15 thousand [1] 1492/24 speculate [1] 1483/24 three [6] 1428/24 1450/14 1473/19 speculating [1] 1436/19 sufficient [1] 1510/8 1473/20 1501/10 1502/5 spelled [1] 1469/15 Suffolk [1] 1508/23 three-week [1] 1428/24 spending [1] 1512/12 suggest [4] 1499/5 1500/2 1508/19 threshold [1] 1469/22 spends [2] 1489/2 1489/3 1512/16 throughout [2] 1485/20 1486/23 spokesman [1] 1505/9 suggested [1] 1497/3 timeline [2] 1442/2 1500/22 spokesperson [2] 1453/2 1453/4 timing [4] 1440/14 1441/23 1443/12 suggesting [6] 1446/4 1446/5 1457/5 spoliation [2] 1441/13 1445/17 1462/21 1468/11 1481/25 1503/15 spotty [1] 1431/2 suggestion [2] 1452/12 1454/22 to -- and [1] 1471/22 springs [2] 1512/3 1512/4 to -- for [1] 1497/6 suggestions [3] 1451/14 1495/19 staffing [1] 1466/4 1497/11 to -- the [1] 1471/16 stake [1] 1491/12 support [3] 1439/5 1439/7 1491/6 to -- when [1] 1473/17 stakes [1] 1438/17 supposed [3] 1445/25 1484/9 1484/11 today [13] 1433/23 1451/8 1451/16 stand [2] 1452/9 1504/18 surprised [1] 1480/10 1452/10 1452/14 1453/10 1460/21 standpoint [1] 1469/1 surprising [1] 1480/8 1477/19 1497/14 1498/7 1498/14 start [3] 1428/20 1442/19 1444/9 suspicious [1] 1446/2 1512/18 1512/22 starting [2] 1443/9 1508/24 switched [2] 1493/2 1493/12 together [1] 1508/18 state [2] 1431/11 1500/8 tomorrow [3] 1497/15 1498/7 1509/14 Sylvia [1] 1427/6 statements [1] 1494/20 system [32] 1431/22 1431/23 1431/25 track [3] 1495/3 1500/7 1505/5 STATES [4] 1426/1 1426/4 1426/11 1432/1 1432/4 1432/5 1433/6 1433/8 traffic [1] 1431/5 1438/8 transactions [3] 1460/2 1461/4 1506/22 1433/9 1433/23 1434/5 1434/25 1435/1 status [1] 1481/5 1435/2 1441/14 1441/16 1443/21 transferable [2] 1499/1 1499/2 stay [1] 1445/15 1443/22 1443/25 1445/1 1445/3 1445/8 Transport [2] 1427/3 1427/3 stayed [1] 1430/21 1446/11 1446/12 1446/22 1448/3 trial [1] 1508/23 stays [1] 1506/3 1448/11 1449/10 1449/11 1496/14 trip [1] 1498/18 stenography [1] 1426/24 1504/22 1505/23 TRO [3] 1480/22 1480/25 1481/1 step [11] 1436/20 1451/7 1451/7 trouble [2] 1447/24 1485/14 1454/23 1458/22 1495/13 1497/23 troubled [2] 1444/2 1451/4 1501/7 1501/8 1501/10 1504/3 table [5] 1436/12 1471/12 1471/24 Trucking [1] 1427/4 steps [4] 1458/22 1495/9 1498/2 1490/21 1512/5 true [3] 1439/18 1445/12 1469/8 1503/18 tails [1] 1434/16 truly [2] 1479/23 1480/10 STEVEN [2] 1426/3 1451/18 Taj [1] 1478/11 trust [2] 1475/3 1492/16 stood [1] 1487/3 target [1] 1495/12 truth [1] 1452/16 storage [1] 1436/25 tech [2] 1435/19 1436/12 truthful [1] 1454/19 store [1] 1498/19 technical [1] 1439/12 turn [1] 1458/6 stored [1] 1435/2 technically [1] 1457/1 turned [2] 1497/4 1501/22 stores [2] 1437/4 1437/22 technological [1] 1434/25 turning [1] 1503/21 straight [1] 1475/5 technology [1] 1441/23 two [87]

Tase 1:15-cv-06861-CBA-JO two-month [1] 1433/10 type [1] 1471/4

types [4] 1471/5 1472/1 1483/17 1483/18

U

ultimately [2] 1448/3 1474/16 unable [2] 1429/2 1429/13 unambiguously [1] 1460/5 unanimous [2] 1462/15 1466/7 underlying [1] 1445/6 understood [10] 1428/18 1429/3 1429/3 1430/7 1435/18 1452/19 1461/14 1472/11 1479/10 1508/2 undertake [1] 1477/7 undertaken [1] 1498/3 undertaking [1] 1507/9 undisclosed [1] 1435/6 undone [1] 1450/23 unfortunate [2] 1476/20 1485/21 unfortunately [4] 1438/24 1473/21 1485/4 1486/22 unhappy [1] 1429/18 UNITED [4] 1426/1 1426/4 1426/11 1438/8 unless [6] 1445/5 1480/17 1482/3 1482/6 1482/12 1512/19 unlike [1] 1491/13 unopened [1] 1491/3 unqualifiedly [2] 1429/20 1429/23 unrealistic [2] 1501/6 1503/19 unresolved [1] 1487/19 update [1] 1428/14 updated [1] 1434/2 upgrade [10] 1431/22 1432/3 1432/21 1432/23 1433/6 1433/9 1433/9 1433/11 1435/8 1442/9 upgraded [2] 1432/4 1432/5 upgrading [1] 1434/25 uphill [1] 1491/20 upload [3] 1432/1 1432/2 1432/3 uploaded [2] 1433/22 1433/25

V

uploading [1] 1434/4

users [1] 1443/9

V-U-L-T-R [1] 1437/15 vague [1] 1468/13 validating [1] 1445/14 vendor [6] 1436/13 1436/15 1436/16 1436/23 1436/25 1489/2 verify [1] 1429/9 versa [1] 1459/5 version [11] 1432/1 1433/18 1433/25 1434/3 1434/4 1434/7 1434/11 1434/12 1434/16 1435/25 1458/20 versions [5] 1436/1 1450/7 1498/13 1498/20 1507/9 versus [1] 1426/5 viability [1] 1470/6 vice [1] 1459/4 view [2] 1487/12 1492/5 vindicate [1] 1451/6 violate [1] 1467/7 violated [2] 1463/17 1464/4 violation [8] 1460/24 1462/23 1463/2 1478/14 1484/7 1487/13 1487/16 1489/16 virtually [1] 1489/21

xis [2] 1477/5 1477/5 Costument 1477/5 Filed 11/02/16

vitiated [1] 1484/192 voluble [1] 1457/22 vouch [3] 1435/23 1435/24 1437/11 VPN [4] 1447/2 1448/8 1448/14 1448/17 Vultan [1] 1436/14 Vultr [1] 1439/8

W wait [2] 1468/19 1489/12 waiting [2] 1493/3 1511/6 waiver [3] 1472/25 1473/6 1473/15 waiving [2] 1488/14 1499/25 wants [3] 1460/20 1474/15 1490/12 warrant [2] 1438/10 1438/14 was -- unless [1] 1482/6 ways [3] 1460/12 1496/18 1512/6 wayside [1] 1489/19 weathered [1] 1458/12 week [16] 1428/24 1429/1 1430/1 1434/4 1483/7 1485/20 1500/15 1500/17 1500/19 1503/17 1505/10 1505/10 1505/10 1508/25 1510/10 1512/12 weekend [1] 1512/15 weigh [5] 1451/1 1453/5 1471/17 1500/2 1503/18 weighing [1] 1461/15 weight [1] 1433/1 what -- he [1] 1473/12 where -- and [1] 1478/10 whispering [1] 1476/14 whole [1] 1488/14 WiFi [1] 1431/1 willful [1] 1487/16 willing [1] 1488/19 wiped [1] 1435/7 wiping [7] 1441/23 1442/24 1443/18 1443/19 1444/11 1444/15 1445/1 wish [2] 1477/15 1487/10 wishes [4] 1449/24 1450/5 1450/9 1487/24 withdrawn [2] 1443/19 1480/17 withheld [2] 1460/22 1468/9 withhold [3] 1467/17 1486/14 1489/11 withholding [7] 1461/1 1463/16 1467/4 1467/7 1487/12 1487/22 1489/16 withholds [1] 1463/15 without -- and [1] 1467/13 without -- when [1] 1480/4 witness [7] 1430/14 1430/21 1430/22 1451/9 1451/17 1491/12 1491/13 witnesses [1] 1452/8 wonder [1] 1469/4 word [2] 1438/14 1482/5 words [2] 1445/11 1511/2 works [2] 1461/10 1505/10 world [2] 1477/5 1500/6 wrap [1] 1492/15 write [3] 1487/17 1504/16 1511/21 writing [2] 1433/13 1455/13 written [2] 1460/19 1490/4

V

years [1] 1480/25 yesterday [6] 1431/14 1436/21 1440/4 1441/2 1444/7 1447/18 yet -- that [1] 1471/19 YORK [3] 1426/1 1426/4 1426/16

Yossi [21] 1428/16 1428/18 1428/22 1429/16 1429/13 1429/19 1429/21

1430/5 1431/10 1433/23 1434/16 1435/22 1435/24 1437/4 1437/22 1438/6 1438/19 1438/23 1442/13 1498/10 1507/20 Yossi's [1] 1438/25